

The Hispanic American Historical Review

Vol. X

February, 1930

No. 1

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

At the annual meeting of the Editorial Board of THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, held at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, on December 31, 1929, Professor William W. Pierson, Jr., of the University of North Carolina, and Professor Arthur Preston Whitaker, of Western Reserve University, were elected to membership in the Board. Professor Charles W. Hackett, of the University of Texas, retired from the Board as his five-year term of service had expired. To the outgoing editor the Board extends its thanks for his uniformly generous and efficient aid, and to the new members, its congratulations. Professor Pierson has already served one term on the Board. It is also a pleasure to announce that Dr. Luís Galdames of Chile has accepted appointment as associate editor for Chile.

A CONFLICT BETWEEN THE COMMERCIAL INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS FOREIGN POLICY

In these days when so much is being written regarding the close coördination between the foreign policies and the business interests of the United States, an instance in which there was an actual clash between the two is worth describing. It is especially so since the incident involves the earlier relations of the United States with Nicaragua and the attitude of the United States toward the Monroe Doctrine in the last decade of the nineteenth century. The purpose of this paper is to describe this conflict as adequately as possible with the materials at hand.

To understand properly and appreciate its significance one should glance briefly at two important trends in American development of the preceding decade. It had been a decade of expansion, commercially and economically. During the period the frontier line had disappeared from the census maps, five transcontinental railroads had been completed, and industrial life in the manufacturing centers of the east had undergone a complete reorganization. This change had produced a marked effect on the government. In this period one finds the beginnings of what was later called imperialism or "jingoism". From the time that President Hayes in a special message to congress, on March 8, 1880, declared that

the policy of this country is a canal under American control and the United States cannot consent to surrender this control to any European power¹

there had been a steady development of this sentiment. The United States was beginning to acquire a consciousness of its

¹ *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, VII. 585-586.

own strength, of its latent power. At such a time a policy of the character of the Monroe Doctrine would naturally occupy an important place in the foreign relations of the nation.

In brief, then, one of the results of commercial and economic expansion was the movement of United States capital into the banana plantations and mahogany forests of the Mosquito Coast of Nicaragua. Another result of the growing expansionist sentiment was the strong disinclination of the United States to permit the slightest interference on the continents of America by foreign powers. This official attitude was bound to react unfavorably on any nation which claimed an interest in the region of the canal routes across Central America. This was especially true of England, many of whose claims in the western hemisphere the United States disputed, and against whom bitterness for its procedure in the Civil War still lingered. So here is an account of how United States commercial interests desired to retain British influence on the Mosquito Coast, an influence which had existed since the decade of the thirties, and of how the United States government somewhat unceremoniously ordered the British out.

It has been difficult to determine the exact extent of United States commercial interests on the Mosquito Coast. The figures given are based mainly on reports taken from various newspapers and from the few accounts of travelers through the region. While their strict accuracy cannot be vouched for, the fact that they come from different sources and yet arrive at approximately the same results should indicate their general accuracy. It is estimated that about five hundred Americans lived on the Mosquito Reserve, one-fifth of whom resided in Bluefields.² The *New York Tribune* in 1894 stated that the first shipment of produce from the region to the United States apparently was made in 1883 and was valued at about \$100.³ By 1893, United States interests in round num-

² *New York Tribune*, April 12, 1894, p. 2, col. 3.

³ *Ibid.*

bers amounted to \$2,000,000 and the trade of the Mosquito Coast with the United States approximated \$4,000,000 per year.⁴ Of the enterprise, wealth, and commerce of the reserve, Minister Baker, after a careful examination, reported that between 90 and 95 per cent was American.⁵ The exports consisted mainly of mahogany, bananas, rubber, gold dust, coconuts, and hides; the imports of flour, kerosene, pork, lard, beef, and manufactured wearing apparel. The *Tribune* also mentions the fact that 2,000 barrels of flour and 1,500 gallons of kerosene were sent from New York and New Orleans monthly. It may be concluded, therefore, that United States trade with Mosquito had grown rapidly through the period of the eighties until in the early nineties it was valued in millions of dollars.

At this time the Mosquito Coast, as a result of the Austrian award of 1880, was very nearly independent of Nicaragua.⁶ Actually it was to all intents and purposes a protectorate of Great Britain. The law of the land was declared by the Mosquito constitution to be the common and statutory law of England

so far as the same can be applicable and not inconsistent with local customs and the enactments of the Chief and Council.⁷

Of the small group of negroes who made up the government, the two leaders were natives of Jamaica who claimed British

⁴ *Ibid.* Approximations to these conclusions are reached in *Popular Science Monthly*, XLV. 160-174; *New York Tribune*, March 8, 1894; *New York Evening Post*, March 10, 1894; U. S. Docs., ser. no. 3275, doc. 20.

⁵ U. S. Docs., ser. no. 3275, doc. 20, p. 87. Also *For. Rel. of the U. S.*, 1894, Appendix I, pp. 289-290. The figures quoted are in my judgment probably the most nearly correct of any, though I have found estimates of the American interests on the Mosquito Coast ranging from \$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000.

⁶ M. W. Williams, *Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy*, pp. 289-293. In 1880, the emperor of Austria, who had been requested by Great Britain and Nicaragua to arbitrate in the dispute over the treaty of Managua, of January 28, 1860, favored the British contention. His award made Nicaraguan suzerainty over the Mosquito reserve established by the treaty of 1860 a merely nominal one.

⁷ *Popular Science Monthly*, June 1894, p. 166. Article by R. J. Kelley, a traveler.

nationality.⁸ Their relations with the British consul were extremely close and it is worthy of note that at the first sign of trouble with Nicaragua, the Mosquito chief threatened to protest to "Her Britannic Majesty's Government".⁹ The *London Times*, moreover, gave evidence of this feeling of intimate relationship on the part of Great Britain when it printed an article from a correspondent on the Mosquito Coast which contained this statement:

Even for diplomatic reasons she [Great Britain] should not relax her hold in this little spot in Central America, which eventually she may need.¹⁰

In 1893, Nicaragua wound up a series of revolutions by the elevation to the presidency of José Santos Zelaya, the man destined to dominate Central American politics for nearly a score of years. As was to be expected after a time of such turmoil, Zelaya faced an empty treasury and a bankrupt government. In casting about for sources of revenue the trade of the Mosquito Coast came under his eye and in November, 1893, he having been elected in September, Zelaya appointed a commissioner named Lacayo to bring the Mosquito Coast back under the sovereignty of Nicaragua. This could be done under the treaty of 1860 between Nicaragua and Great Britain whenever the natives so wished. According to his instructions, Lacayo was to accomplish this task "if possible by diplomatic methods". The diplomatic methods, it turned out, consisted of an attempt to bribe the rulers of Mosquito. The failure of this attempt was laid by Lacayo to the opposition of United States business men.¹¹ If Lacayo's charges were

⁸ *For. Rels. of the U. S.*, 1894, Appendix I, p. 236.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 235.

¹⁰ *London Times*, March 27, 1894.

¹¹ This account of Lacayo's commission is taken from *For. Rels. of the U. S.*, 1894, Appendix I, p. 287, Minister Baker to Secretary Gresham, May 10, 1894. The *New York Tribune*, April 5, 1894, p. 5, col. 3, states that the revenue of the Coast was Zelaya's object and attributes the information to a member of the state department.

justified, and the United States minister, Baker, denied them, this is the first indication of the opposition to Nicaraguan rule which the Yankee element was later to manifest so strenuously.

Such was the situation when, in January, 1894, Nicaragua and Honduras went to war. A report was promptly circulated that Honduras was about to invade Nicaragua through Cape Gracias and the Mosquito Coast, and Nicaraguan troops were rushed to the reserve. It was thought by some people in the region that the whole proceeding was only a scheme to occupy the territory with Nicaraguan troops.¹² Since a small skirmish was actually fought, this idea was probably false, but the situation did serve Nicaragua's purpose. It was also the occasion for calls upon the United States and England for warships to protect the citizens of the two nations. In compliance with these requests, the Washington government ordered the U. S. S. *Kearsarge* to Bluefields and the British sent the H. M. S. *Cleopatra*. Unfortunately the *Kearsarge* rammed a mischarted reef and the *Cleopatra* alone arrived.

On February 10, Nicaraguan troops occupied Bluefields and two days later martial law was proclaimed, despite the fact that no resistance was offered.¹³ This occupation of the city and assumption of authority by Lacayo was opposed by the foreigners whose business interests were located in the region. Their opposition only became vocal, however, when Lacayo announced a duty on the export of bananas.¹⁴ The occupation was a direct violation of the Austrian award of 1880¹⁵ and largely because of it the British consul threatened to interfere with the aid of British troops.¹⁶ Consul S. C. Braida, at San Juan del Norte, was one who clearly foresaw the issues involved in the Nicaraguan occupation. He closed

¹² *London Times*, March 27, 1894.

¹³ *For. Rels. of the U. S.*, 1894, Appendix I, p. 245.

¹⁴ U. S. Docs., ser. no. 3275, doc. 20, p. 38.

¹⁵ M. W. Williams, *Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy*, p. 293.

¹⁶ *For. Rels. of the U. S.*, 1894, Appendix I, pp. 238, 239.

his report of the situation to Lewis Baker, United States minister at Managua, with the words,

This sudden change from a comparative state of independence to one of purely bayonet rule has had a paralyzing effect on every line of industry, and if it continues will certainly lead to a disastrous shrinkage in values of every description.¹⁷

In the same communication there was enclosed a copy of a letter from a number of United States business men to Consul Seat, in which, as the climax of their complaints, they stated that the commissioner proposed to "increase said duties and collect them".¹⁸ To one familiar with the way the Mosquito government had functioned, the last phrase is obviously the one to which chief objection was raised. In short, the North Americans, mainly for commercial reasons, very decidedly opposed the extension of Nicaraguan control over the Mosquito Coast.¹⁹

The issue was not joined between these Americans and their government, however, until British troops were landed to preserve order and Mosquito control. This took place on March 2, at which time a brief fight occurred between the British and Mosquitos on the one side and the Nicaraguans on the other.²⁰ There can be no doubt that the North Americans on the ground welcomed the British with real enthusiasm. Consular Agent B. B. Seat, established at Bluefields, wrote that practically the entire population, native and foreign, was in active sympathy with the British marines.²¹ One individual even tried to harmonize the procedure with the Monroe Doctrine when he wrote:

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 243.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 246.

¹⁹ On March 17, Consul Braida wrote: "The Americans residing here realize the necessity of getting clear of the incompetent negro domination, but they are afraid of Nicaraguan cupidity and tyranny." *Ibid.*, p. 253.

²⁰ *New York Times*, March 14, 1894, p. 3, col. 2.

²¹ *For. Rels. of the U. S.*, 1894, Appendix I, p. 254.

President Monroe never meant his Doctrine to deprive the United States citizens of their rights, or to assist a despotic nation [Nicaragua] to control a weak and liberal government like Mosquito.²²

The two sides to the question were recognized quite clearly in the United States. President Cleveland stated the issue in his second annual message to congress,²³ and several newspapers editorially informed the public on the subject.²⁴ Perhaps the clearest and most compact statement was in a *Tribune* editorial:

[The State Department] ought not to support Great Britain's right to intervene in Nicaraguan affairs, for that will involve repudiation of the Monroe Doctrine. Theoretically the Department ought to be in sympathy with the ulterior purpose of Nicaragua to obtain complete control of all its seaboard and territories, and to break down Jamaica negro domination. Practically, however, it will have to deal with the fact that American interests on that coast have been promoted by territorial rule and customs regulations, and that those interests will be damaged by the permanent administration of the country on Nicaraguan lines.²⁵

Taken as a whole United States sentiment clung to the Monroe Doctrine with an almost fanatical fervor. The *Tribune*, after severely criticizing Secretary Gresham's report on the landing of British troops, declares:

Lord Kimberly may make what disclaimers he pleases . . . but the fact remains that the Cleopatra's marines intervened in the political affairs of Central America, and that Great Britain has exercised by force of arms the right of protecting the Mosquito Reservation. That is in direct violation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty.²⁶

The *New York Herald* announced that "it is the purpose of the Administration to pursue a vigorous policy in this

²² *New York Tribune*, May 5, 1894, p. 4, col. 4, 5.

²³ *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, IX. 528.

²⁴ The *New Orleans Picayune* carried a very clear summary of the situation.

²⁵ *New York Tribune*, April 8, 1894, p. 6, col. 2.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, March 21, 1894, p. 6, col. 4.

matter" and then dilated upon the importance of United States supremacy in all sections of the western hemisphere, especially Nicaragua.²⁷ The *Tribune* even went so far as to denounce the Americans living on the Coast because they did not take kindly to the reestablishment of Nicaraguan rule. It contradicted a statement from them to the effect that such rule would curtail their trade, and insisted, on the contrary, that their trade would be expanded.²⁸

The attitude of the government reflected that of the newspapers of the country. An immediate and vigorous demand was made on England for an explanation.²⁹ At the same time Minister Baker at Managua was ordered to rush the details of the story to Washington. In the cablegram to Minister Baker an interesting distinction is made, interesting at least to those who have followed recent developments in regard to the Monroe Doctrine:

Did Great Britain land troops under asserted right of sovereignty, or only for protection?³⁰

Fortunately, the British explanation was adequate and international complications over the actual landing of troops did not arise. It was upon the United States agents in Nicaragua who had shown a certain amount of approval for the British action that governmental displeasure fell. Consul Braida was first given a lecture for being "in active sympathy with the British armed occupancy of Bluefields".³¹ Somewhat later, Minister Baker made an agreement with the foreign minister of Nicaragua, by which, in the interests of peace, the Nicaraguan soldiers were to be quartered outside of the city of Bluefields. The Nicaraguans broke this agreement and

²⁷ *New York Herald*, March 15, 1894, p. 5, col. 6.

²⁸ *New York Tribune*, May 5, 1894, p. 6, col. 3. Other papers taking this attitude included the *Cleveland Leader*, *New York Recorder*, *Hartford Courant*, and *Commercial Advertiser*.

²⁹ *For. Rel. of the U. S.*, 1894, Appendix I, p. 250.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ U. S. Docs., ser. no. 3275, doc. 20, p. 50.

Baker protested. As a result of the controversy thus raised, Gresham wrote to Baker:

The President is unable to sanction any intervention by you, restricting the sovereign authority of Nicaragua over the territory occupied by the Mosquito Indians. Recognizing as this Government does the paramount rights of the Republic in that region, it ill becomes the representative of the United States to interfere to restrain the Nicaraguan Government in the exercise of those sovereign rights.³²

The next difficulty arose when Captain Howe of the *Cleopatra*, realizing that the complete autonomy of Mosquito could not be maintained, in conjunction with Lacayo tried to organize a provisional government that would keep order on the Coast. The Americans would have nothing to do with this attempt. Even when, in spite of their objections, Lacayo appointed some of them to the provisional council, they refused to serve. Their opposition was based on a fear that the provisional government would in some way abrogate the treaty of 1860 and bring Mosquito back under Nicaraguan control. It was stated in the following language:

Believing that Mosquito under Spanish [Nicaraguan] rule means the utter ruin of all that American capital and energy has accomplished and built up here in such a wonderfully successful manner in the past few years . . . I beg to state that . . . the natives, creoles as well as Indians, have completely taken our standpoint and will under all circumstances go with us to maintain autonomy to Mosquito.³³

A week after this statement of Consul Braidia it was reinforced by a petition from a committee of United States citizens who detailed very carefully all acts of Lacayo that could in any way hinder or cramp the business interests of the Coast.³⁴

³² *For. Rels. of the U. S.*, 1894, Appendix I, p. 296.

³³ U. S. Docs., ser. no. 3275, doc. 20, p. 33.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

The answer of the United States government to Braida was brief and to the point:

You are not authorized to perform diplomatic functions, and will not meddle in political affairs of Mosquito.³⁵

Ignoring the obvious desire of the government, the Americans on the Coast held a meeting at which resolutions were adopted denouncing the Nicaraguans and pledging their support to the deposed Mosquito government. They even went to the extreme of inviting the former chief to "resume the reins of government".³⁶

Secretary Gresham, meanwhile, was watching with anything but favor the British-directed attempts to establish some sort of a government. On April 30, in a note to Ambassador Bayard in London, he stated his position in no uncertain terms:

I am unable to see that this joint assumption of authority by British and Nicaraguan agents is compatible with the stipulations of the Treaty of Managua. . . . The stipulations exclude all idea of local government by others than the Indians in the Reservation. . . . That the provisional government formulated by the representatives of Nicaragua and Great Britain provides for the appointment of American, Indian and Creole representatives on the proposed governing commission, in no wise alters the essential character of the transaction. The arrangement itself rests on no sound basis of existing right. . . . You are in a position to express to Lord Kimberly the President's hope and expectation that the anomalous situation now disclosed may speedily cease and that no foreign agency shall be permitted to dictate or participate in the administration of the affairs in the Mosquito territory.³⁷

The message left no room for doubt as to Gresham's attitude and the British, who were looking for anything but

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

³⁶ *New York Tribune*, April 9, 1894, p. 1, col. 3.

³⁷ U. S. Docs., ser. no. 3275, doc. 20, pp. 68-69.

trouble, quietly withdrew. It is interesting to note that within two weeks of the time Gresham's message was sent, the Americans on the Coast presented the British commander there a rather different communication. This thanked him for the help and protection he had afforded them, commented on the mutual interests of Great Britain and the United States, and concluded thus:

Although of two nations, we are of but one people and we trust that at some near future day, a real and higher federation of our naval forces may occur; and as the twin stars brought hope to the mariners of old, so will the glorious flags of Great Britain and America guarantee abiding peace and protection throughout the world.³⁸

British influence having been withdrawn, affairs on the Coast went from bad to worse until, on July 5, the Mosquito chief executed a *coup d'état* and returned to power. The Nicaraguans were summarily ousted though there seems to have been little actual violence. This latter fact was probably partly due to the prompt landing of United States marines who this time were on the spot.³⁹ That the resident Americans favored this change, there can be no doubt. Some of them were injudicious enough actually to take part in the events.⁴⁰ One also finds that the Americans who had refused to have anything to do with the provisional government in which Nicaragua was involved, occupied three places on the council of state, the magistracy of Bluefields, and commanded the police or militia of the new government.⁴¹

³⁸ *New York Tribune*, April 14, 1894, p. 1, col. 2.

³⁹ Commander Charles O'Neil of the U. S. A. had charge of the United States marines and his letters give an excellent picture of the situation. He obviously has little use for the Mosquito government though he recognizes that practically all of the foreigners favor it. U. S. Docs., ser. no. 3275, doc. 20. Letters on pages 135, 137, 145, 148, 158, 162.

⁴⁰ References to these Americans may be found in U. S. Docs., ser. no. 3275, doc. 20, pp. 159, 160, 163, 164, 169.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 146, 159.

Such proceedings could be viewed only with displeasure at Washington and the government hastened to announce that these people could expect no support from it.⁴²

For a month and a half the Mosquito government functioned. Then, during August, Nicaraguan troops quietly re-occupied Bluefields and reasserted Nicaraguan authority. Some of the Americans who had held office under the Mosquito régime were arrested, but the government of the United States, in spite of its previous statement, saw that they were not badly treated. In November, a farcical vote was held in which the people of the Coast declared for incorporation into Nicaragua. So the question was settled.

United States commercial interests had opposed this solution. The United States government had favored it. The British, on whom the commercial interests and the Mosquito government depended for support, were eliminated as a factor in the situation by a vigorous note from the United States government. Thus passed into history one of the few conflicts between United States governmental policy and United States business men, a conflict not of major importance, but one which helps ever so little to make clear two of the important trends in the history of the time.

RISEING LAKE MORROW.

Wesleyan University,
Middletown, Connecticut.

⁴² *For. Rel. of the U. S.*, 1894, Appendix I, p. 313.

SPANISH OPINION OF THE NORTH AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

In the rehabilitation of modern Spanish history, the brilliant ministry of O'Donnell from 1856-63 stands out as the most interesting period. It was the first time during the century that one of the series of military leaders who governed the country was backed by a widely diffused political majority. The union-liberal party of O'Donnell represented, moreover, for the first time in the century an attempt to draw together all elements in Spain toward a vivid, grandiose, and really Spanish foreign policy.

In 1861, however, O'Donnell's exceedingly brilliant and popular régime was already on the wane. The heterogeneous elements which had given him support on the abstract basis of "Dynasty and Constitution", and on the concrete basis of glory abroad for Spain, were falling apart. The reactionary elements in the country were growing restless of their dependent rôle in the union-liberal coalition. The republican leader, Cánovas del Castillo, O'Donnell's most brilliant follower, had definitely broken with him. Events abroad were also having a definite influence in breaking up the coalition. O'Donnell's policy of doing nothing at home while attempting everything abroad, after involving Spain in costly expeditions in Morocco and the Far East, had led to a serious undertaking to reincorporate Santo Domingo (March, 1861), and was about to draw Spain into the triple convention against Mexico, where, indeed, it is reasonably certain that O'Donnell was the first to desire to play a bold game. Both these expeditions, however, belied their hopes. O'Donnell's rival, Prim, it is true, retreated in time from Mexico; but Santo Domingo proved O'Donnell's grave. In 1863, he resigned, and with O'Donnell's resignation, Spain ceased to play an active part in the new world.

Had O'Donnell's ministry in 1861 still been strong, had Spain been already in Mexico as well as in Santo Domingo, it might have played a leading part in the events of the civil war. Immediate recognition of the south would have been the bold and logical course to take; and strong support of Napoleon in Mexico, or even of a Spanish princess on the Mexican throne, would have been a desirable corollary. As things were, however, a more circumspect procedure was advisable.

O'Donnell was, it is certain, undoubtedly glad that the federal government would have to concern itself with other ambitions than those contained in the Ostend manifesto concerning Cuba. The North American civil war, indeed, opened wide the door for the accomplishment of the ambitious scheme of bringing Santo Domingo, and possibly Mexico, back into Spain's sphere of influence. But while the government realized the advantages to Spain of the civil war, and while it estimated the south and north as opponents equal in strength and resources, the prudent course to take for a secondary power, with a government whose popularity was waning, was to wait and see what the great powers would do, what attitude the north would adopt toward, and what assurances the south would give, concerning Mexico and Cuba. O'Donnell, therefore, determined to follow the example of England and France by issuing a proclamation of neutrality. Carl Schurz, the American minister in Madrid, wrote:

This government does not mean to provoke a difficulty with us, and will, I think, earnestly endeavour to avoid a conflict with us under all circumstances.¹

Indeed, after the first union defeat at Bull Run, Schurz reported that Spain, because of its exposed West Indian possessions, would take no initiative in recognizing the south. The south, however, had sanguine hopes to the contrary. Preston of Kentucky, Buchanan's minister at Madrid, had so

¹ *U. S. Dip. Corr.*, November 9, 1861: Schurz to Seward.

labored in the latter part of his term of office to aid the impending confederacy that the court and society, in June, 1861, were deeply imbued with the idea of an aristocratic and chivalrous south armed to resist the aggression of a *sans culotte* north. The upper classes in Spain were, moreover, still full of resentment at the North American filibustering of former years in Cuba. They believed those raids to have been inspired by the northern states, and they believed in consequence that the southerners would prove good friends of Spain. The reactionaries and conservatives in Spain, therefore, welcomed the collapse of the western republic. Spanish liberals, meanwhile, had no vital or direct interest in the preservation of the union.

The south, as a result of this state of feeling in Spain, thought that Havana might easily be made use of as an entrepôt for foreign munitions and as a refuge for confederate vessels. In July, 1861, a confederate agent was sent to assure the Cuban captain general of the friendly intentions of the south; and on August 24, Judge Rost, a distinguished southerner, was ordered to ask for recognition in Madrid, on the double ground of the community of the Spanish and southern social systems, and of the proximity of the confederacy to Cuba.

Seward, on his side, took instantly a firm stand by asserting the principle of the indivisibility of the union. He labored, moreover, to point out that the filibustering and annexationist designs on Cuba and Mexico had been inspired, not by the north but by the south, and that they might well have succeeded, had they not been restrained by the northern influence in the federal government. The south, Seward asserted, had, in fact, revolted with the avowed intention of expanding in Mexico and Cuba. In several long interviews with Calderón de Collantes, the Spanish foreign minister, the United States chargé drove this point successfully home.

Shortly afterward, Seward, by his deference to neutral rights in the "Trent" episode, strengthened his position further in the eyes of the Spanish government. The first suc-

cessful effect of northern diplomacy in Spain appeared in March, 1862, when Calderón informed Rost that Spain would take no initiative in recognizing the south. His health broken, Rost returned home, and in a speech at New Orleans, just before its capture by the northern troops, confessed that the confederacy had no real friends abroad. A month later, Spain's withdrawal from Mexico removed all apprehension in the north as to Spanish hostile intentions in that quarter. Indeed, in May, 1862, the United States chargé, writing to Seward of the aftermath of Mexican affairs, stated that

Spain has earned the high regard of the United States by withdrawing from the Mexican scheme, while she has shown that she could assert her rights in America when aggrieved. A limited faction of deputies, officers, men who have been in Paris, and state officers (who represent a considerable *côterie*) has maintained that a close alliance with France is the only safe and fruitful policy for Spain. The Moderado opposition believes Napoleon the only statesman in Europe. But they are overborne at present by a majority of all classes, who desire a strictly national and Spanish policy.²

Meanwhile, however, the triumph of French policy in Italy, and the rumor that the United States was about to take several states from Mexico as security for a loan to the Mexican government increased the strength of the Franco-Mexican party in Spain: and, when exaggerated accounts arrived of federal reverses before Richmond, pro-southern feeling in Spain noticeably increased. "The governing classes here", wrote the United States chargé to Seward in the early autumn of 1862,

always desirous of the separation of the Republic, always avowedly in sympathy with the rebels from the beginning, have seized these indications with avidity.³

An entente with France, a new expedition to Mexico, and recognition of the confederacy now became parts of the same

² *U. S. Dip. Corr.*, May 25, 1862: Perry to Seward.

³ *Ibid.*, August 1, 1862: Perry to Seward.

policy, and this policy appeared for a time steadily to gain ground.

Such a state of affairs had, in fact, been foreseen a year before by Seward's vigorous new minister in Madrid, Carl Schurz, and had caused him to return to the United States, in order to arouse the one thing capable of appealing to Spanish liberals—namely, abolition sentiment. It was well, indeed, that he had decided to do so; for, in September, 1862, the United States chargé, dwelling upon the alarming state of Spanish opinion, reported that the dark hour for the union in Europe had now come. "Even the more liberal classes", he wrote,

wonder why we want to coerce the South, which by its valour and vigour has demonstrated its condition to be a solid, separate nation. Against this, I am using the slavery argument. This is the only point which has told for us, and editors have not ceased to reproduce it. Popular ideas of democratic sovereignty are against us. Nothing, they think, is lost in the Montgomery constitution. *Our cause here wavers as the issue of slavery is more or less clear.*⁴

Spain would not have moved without France. But it would almost certainly have followed France in recognizing the south in the autumn of 1862 or later, had not Schurz's efforts at home borne fruit. Lincoln's emancipation policy won, in fact—but to an even large degree—the same decisive victory for the north in Spain as it did in France. Reactionary Spain, thereafter, dared not urge a pro-southern policy, while liberal Spain had now the example of the northern states to bring forward as a weapon in its campaign on behalf of emancipation in the Spanish colonies. The result was that, after the downfall of O'Donnell in 1863, the successive Spanish governments, while still friendly to the south, had neither the power nor the will to prove their feelings in any practical way. Discussion as to the outcome of the war and as to recognition continued, but it was without practical importance. The Span-

⁴ *Ibid.*, August 1, and September 21, 1862.

ish government shut the Spanish ports to confederate cruisers, and refused Slidell's offer to adhere to the Cuban tripartite treaty. Distinctly favorable expressions of opinion toward the north appeared in the liberal papers; and these were reinforced by the translation into pamphlet form of Seward's circulars and other diplomatic notes. His conciliatory action in the case of an English ship pursued by a federal cruiser into Cuban territorial waters gained further ground for the northern cause. When, therefore, criticism of the Santo Domingo expedition, and pessimism regarding the French Mexican empire came to a head in 1864, just at the time that the southern cause began to appear to Europe as hopeless, the north could congratulate itself upon having won a more decisive victory in the field of public opinion in Spain than it had won in either England or France.

A short review of Spanish newspaper comment, indeed, brings out vividly the interesting way in which Lincoln's emancipation led directly to the victory of the north in Spain.

There were six leading newspapers in Spain. The *Pensamiento Español* represented Carlist opinion. The *Época*, the *España*, and the *Diario* gave the different shades of ministerial opinion; while the *Iberia* and the *Discusión* contain the very interesting liberal views of the war. Since most of the news in all these papers was copied from abroad, and since editorial comment on the war was comparatively rare, it follows that the resulting information is for historical purposes meager. But if foreign affairs were seen through the wrong end of an opera glass, they were nevertheless judged in a characteristically Spanish way.

A few quotations will suffice to show what sort of comment was from time to time printed in the ministerial, pro-southern papers.

The *Pensamiento Español* considered that

the war may continue a long time or a short time, but the indubitable result will be the independence of the Southern States.⁵

⁵ 19 August, 1862.

Shortly afterward, in September, 1862, under the spell of southern successes and promises, it published a remarkable editorial showing in full measure the temper and attitude of the average extreme reactionary in Spain.⁶ This editorial declared:

In the model republic of what *were* the United States, we see more and more clearly of how little account is a society constituted without God, merely for the sake of men. Look at their wild ways of annihilating each other, confiscating each other's goods, mutually destroying each other's cities, and cordially wishing each other extinct! The Federals declare their enemies' slaves free, and the latter refuse to allow Federal regiments of whites and blacks any rights of war. Both muzzle the press; both vie with each other in reprisals; and at the end of a year of war they are both on the road to becoming barbarians. The history of the model republic can be summed up in a few words. It came into being by rebellion. It was founded on atheism. It was populated by the dregs of all the nations in the world. It has lived without law of God or man. Within a hundred years, greed has ruined it. Now it is fighting like a cannibal, and it will die in a flood of blood and mire. Such is the real history of the one and only state in the world which has succeeded in constituting itself according to the flaming theories of democracy. The example is too horrible to stir any desire for imitation in Europe.

This same paper confirmed Schurz's judgment of the effect on Europe of an anti-slavery policy on the part of the north, by accusing the Spanish democratic papers of supporting the federal government solely because of its anti-slavery attitude. The *Pensamiento Español*, therefore, did not cease to point out in return the northern hatred of the negro and the widespread northern democratic repudiation of Lincoln's proclamation.

In the other ministerial, pro-southern newspapers, northern armies and victories were systematically undervalued and usually mentioned without comment. The *Época* expatiated on the endlessness of the war, and delighted in giving ex-

⁶ September 6, 1862.

amples of northern mob rule and violence. As early as April, 1861, moreover, it raised the cry of the necessity of European intervention. In any event, it hoped, the civil war would plant European-like states in North America. The *España*, which never wearied of publishing all the gossip of the *Times*, *Morning Post*, and *Patrie*, considered the war a proof of the wickedness of the Yankee "grande idea" of democracy, and thanked God that Spain has never been sullied by such a heresy. Europe, it wrote, was bound to gain by the exhaustion of the combatants. The union victory at Antietam was so much propaganda; everything the union had done had been unsuccessful. The Emancipation Proclamation was, indeed, for the *España*, only a "first-rate political blunder", fatal to the northern cause. The *España*, in fact, was the bitterest of all the Spanish newspapers against Palmerston's rejection of the French proposal for mediation of November, 1862. Of this it said:

All Europe felt it to be the right time, and only England's selfish interests have prevented action. The North cannot ever win, and should be stopped before it commits suicide.

The *España* continued even in 1863 to believe separation inevitable and advantageous, and still maintained that Europe's interest lay in gaining the south as a friend by recognizing it before the war ended. The time for doing so, it wrote, should not be far off. France should be the first; then Spain; then England.

The third ministerial newspaper, the *Diario*, agreed with this opinion. Separation, it argued, was not only inevitable; it was also necessary for the security of European possessions in the new world, and for the advance of Spanish prestige in Hispanic America. The *Diario* considered that the real aim of the struggle in the United States was the possession of the Mississippi; the north, it predicted, would conquer the riverbank, but the south would gain its independence. Thus Cuba would be assured to Spain. Slavery, meanwhile,

was merely a subject of agitation. Lincoln's proclamation was only an arbitrary order. But the war, the *Diario* noticed in the autumn of 1862, revealed "our lack of precise knowledge of anything but the *political* scene in America". It, therefore, began to study the social side of the struggle. In an interesting series of articles, it came to the conclusion that slavery, as an institution, if left to itself, was because of quite natural factors doomed everywhere to extinction. Slavery could not, therefore, be considered a political disgrace, either generally speaking, or, for example, in particular lands like the Spanish colonies, where it was dying. In the United States, however, after having been admitted into the constitution, slavery had become the political basis of the south, and had resulted in an aggressive, unscrupulous policy of ambition that would never be satisfied. The south depended on the upkeep of slavery. The south was an artificial confederacy, the *Diario* decided. It could not, therefore, attract Spain by offers of alliance. The final opinion of the *Diario* went further. It declared that the northern cause was the juster, and that its forces for putting an end to southern designs were "the most noble forces". All that remained, therefore, in 1863, of the preliminary pro-southern attitude of the *Diario* was the feeling that, of the two ways to peace which remained open, one seemed each day more probable—namely northern triumph. In default of this, the only other solution was an agreement—but without European interference—between the north and the south to condemn and circumscribe slavery.

When we come to the democratic *Discusión* and the progressive *Iberia* and *Novidades*, still more interesting comments favorable to the north occur.

In its news articles, the *Discusión*, which was uniformly as favorable as possible to the north, emphasized such events as Antietam and Lincoln's proclamation—"that policy of salvation which alone justifies the struggle"—with all due im-

portance. In the dark summer of 1862, the *Discusión* was against recognition of the south by Europe, because of its belief that slavery was doomed. It warned France that if it went into the American war it would meet its Moscow. Separation was perhaps inevitable; but the south was the turbulent aggressor; while the north would still remain the really first-rate power on the continent.

Continuing the discussion of the war, the *Discusión* combated the argument of the reactionary newspapers that the war was due to the baneful effect of democracy. Slavery, lack of democracy, it maintained, was the real cause of the war. The *Discusión*, therefore, appreciated the forces which hindered Lincoln from acting quickly with regard to abolition, and called what he had done, by August, 1862, "a great attempt, a sublime work". It refuted the plea of *Época* for recognition, arguing that the south was an undesirable neighbor and that its independence would necessitate the formation of an Hispanic American protective league. In November, 1862, it devoted a whole page to condemning the southern thesis in all its details. When the French offer of mediation of that month was published, it at once saw the vicious commercial pressure behind it. In equally vigorous terms, *Discusión* continued to defend the north, and by the end of the year, indeed, this organ may be said to have itself firmly attached to the northern cause in all its respects.

The *Iberia*, the principal progresista organ, often fined for its political utterances, began by publishing Lincoln's message of July, 1861, as the best summary of the American question. It noted, however, that Prince Napoleon had concluded from his journey in the United States that separation, while disgraceful, was inevitable. In December, 1861, it regretted Lincoln's reserve as to slavery. It pointed out that abolition was in reality

the only way to give character to the struggle, to justify the war, and to arouse the applause of all those who are sincerely interested in the future of humanity.

The *Iberia* followed the "Trent" episode with the utmost attention, as, indeed, all the Madrid papers did, and went so far as to believe with the rest that war was inevitable, because of Seward's "stiff, obstinate, and over-confident" attitude. Sooner or later, it thought, the question of cotton would in any case bring England and the north to blows. In March, 1862, nevertheless, since neither England nor France would move to save the confederacy, the *Iberia* began to see the end of the south in sight. In June, however, it noted Persigny's presence in London, and believed joint negotiations about to open. All during the summer of 1862, indeed, the *Iberia* followed carefully the southern efforts to create on the continent a belief in the success of the confederacy. It warned its readers, however, against believing everything said about northern disasters. In October, it went much further. The north, it wrote, was now winning everywhere. Then came the Emancipation Proclamation. This, wrote the *Iberia*, would eternally honor the Washington government.

Among its later articles on the northern cause is a very interesting review, published in February, 1864, by General Prim, relating to his visit to the United States after the Spanish withdrawal from Mexico. "I never decried the military possibilities of the United States in time of war", he stated, "although Europe looked upon the States as powerless". He then described his visit to the Army of the Potomac. "As to the number of first-rate soldiers, the United States is the first nation in the world." In this respect, moreover, Prim pointed out, the north and the south were one people, since

whenever it is a question of America for the Americans, they will be on the same side, even if distinct states.

In conclusion, he lavished praise on North American institutions, especially upon the courts and the rapidity of justice, and dismissed all the scandals about northern corruption and tyranny as simply "not true".

It is both pleasant and enlightening to end this short résumé of Spanish opinion with the words of Spain's greatest and most sensible leader of the century, the man who saved Spain in Mexico, and thus helped to keep that country free from an overwhelming disgrace in the new world—perhaps, indeed, from an earlier edition of a Spanish-American war.

EDWIN F. PRATT.

Vienna, Austria.

ARGENTINA AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE, 1824-1828

The United States had scarcely recognized the United Provinces of the River Plate as an independent nation—an exchange of ministers had not yet, in fact, been effected—when it was impelled by force of circumstances to take another step fraught with meaning for the Buenos Aireans as for Hispanic America in general. This step was the announcement of those principles of national policy which have come to be known as the Monroe Doctrine.

Monroe's pronouncement was received with favor in Buenos Aires, though not with unbounded enthusiasm. Minister Caesar A. Rodney wrote that "the frank and firm message of the President arrived in good season" and had been "productive of happy effects". A suggestion of disappointment at the response in that field is contained in his further statement: "But I look not so much to its temporary influence as its permanent operation".¹ In February, 1824, extensive extracts from the document were printed in *El Argos*, *La Gaceta Mercantil*, and *El Avisador Mercantil*, newspapers of Buenos Aires. This fact, thinks Norberto Piñero, attests the importance which was attached to the president's action.² It was a part of the instructions of Alvear, minister of the United Provinces to the United States, that he should suggest adding to the principles of the president's message the further one that no new government of South America should change by violence its limits as recognized at the time of its emancipation.³ In its reply to the message of the executive power in

¹ Rodney to Adams, May 22, 1824. MS. Department of State, Dispatches from Argentina, II. Rodney had the message translated into Spanish and distributed in the United Provinces, in Chile, and in Peru.

² *La política internacional argentina* (Buenos Aires, 1924), p. 69.

³ *Ibid.*

which information of this fact was given, the junta of representatives expressed its full conformity with these views.⁴ Addressing this body on December 16, 1824, Governor Las Heras,⁵ charged with the national executive power, declared that the United States, supposing the Spanish Americans capable of struggling single-handed with the power of Spain, had constituted itself "*guardián del campo del combate, para no permitir se introduzca otro a dar ayuda a nuestro rival*".⁶

John M. Forbes, as chargé d'affaires at Buenos Aires,⁷ was instructed by Secretary of State Clay, in reference to the Monroe Doctrine "to urge upon the government of Buenos Aires the utility and expediency of asserting the same principles on all occasions".⁸ When on August 28, 1825, Forbes was officially received by Governor Las Heras he obeyed the injunction of the secretary. President Monroe's message, he said, asserted

two very important principles of law in the relations between Europe and America. . . . In the maintenance of these principles, all the independent Governments of America have a strong interest, and it is hoped that the Government of Buenos Aires, far from disavowing, will feel the utility of asserting them on all proper occasions. . . . I am instructed to say, that the present President . . . continues entirely to coincide in that declaration.⁹

To these remarks the governor replied:

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ In May, 1824, Juan Gregorio de Las Heras succeeded Rodríguez as governor of Buenos Aires. See William Spence Robertson, "South America and the Monroe Doctrine," *Political Science Quarterly*, XXX. (1915), 100.

⁶ *Los Mensajes* (H. Mabragaña, ed.). *Historia del desenvolvimiento de la nación argentina redactada cronológicamente por sus gobernantes, 1810-1910*, I. 211.

⁷ On the death of Minister Rodney in June, 1824, Forbes was commissioned chargé, the date of his commission being March 9, 1825. See William R. Manning, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States concerning the Independence of the Latin-American Nations* (New York, 1925), I. 130.

⁸ Quoted by Robertson in "South America and the Monroe Doctrine", *loc. cit.*, p. 100.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

The Government of the United Provinces knows the importance of the two great principles which The Honble. President of the United States has laid down in his message to Congress—and, convinced of the utility of their adoption by all the states of the continent, will consider it an honorable duty to second them, and to that end to avail itself of every opportunity which may present.¹⁰

It is evident that Monroe's principles pleased the United Provinces. One authority on the Doctrine believes appreciation there and in Spanish America in general would have been greater but for the fact that danger of European intervention did not seem so imminent to the people there as to President Monroe and that in so far as the Spanish Americans believed in the danger at all they looked to Great Britain to avert it rather than to the United States.¹¹

Dexter Perkins believes that the president's message may have been influential in stimulating in Europe discussion of the scheme of establishing Bourbon monarchies in the new world, for that discussion was carried on quite vigorously in the early months of 1824.¹² Quite without effect, however, for the obstinacy of the Spanish king shattered all such projects.¹³ It is believed, too, that the message stimulated those Englishmen who, from commercial motives chiefly, advocated immediate recognition of the former Spanish provinces.¹⁴ The Argentine historian Mitre says that one result of Monroe's manifesto was the abandonment by the European allies of the project of intervention in Spain's favor,¹⁵ but Perkins at-

¹⁰ Enclosure with Forbes to Clay, September 18, 1825. MS. Département of State, Dispatches from Argentina, II.

¹¹ Dexter Perkins, *The Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826* (Cambridge, 1927), pp. 150-154.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 244. See also his article, "Europe, Spanish America and the Monroe Doctrine," in *American Historical Review*, XXVII. (1922), 217, 218.

¹³ Perkins, *Monroe Doctrine*, p. 243.

¹⁴ Robertson, *History of the Latin-American Nations* (New York, 1922), p. 187. See also H. W. V. Temperley, "The Later American Policy of George Canning", in *American Historical Review*, XI. 779-797.

¹⁵ *Historia de Belgrano* (Buenos Aires, 1887), p. 95.

tributes the failure of this project to England's refusal to act with the continental powers.¹⁶

It was the general feeling among South American statesmen that Monroe meant what he said and that North American protection had been extended over the new republics.¹⁷ The declaration of Governor Las Heras that the United States had constituted itself "guardian of the field of battle"¹⁸ indicates that this was the feeling in the United Provinces.

Less than three years after the pronouncement of the Doctrine an occasion arose for an appeal to the United States by the United Provinces on the basis of its principles. This occasion was the war which broke out in 1826 between the United Provinces and Brazil over rights in Uruguay, then known as the Banda Oriental. Each nation claimed the region as a part of its territory.

On August 17, 1826, in a conference with Forbes, Rivadavia, then president of the Argentine Republic,¹⁹ touched—using the language of Forbes's report—

on the policy of shutting out from this Continent all European power and influence as declared by the late and present President of the U. S. and noticed the obvious connection of Europe and Brazil, more especially of Portugal (to whose crown he considered Don Pedro's renunciation a mere form) and also of the direct participation of Don Pedro [emperor of Brazil] in the views of the Holy Alliance, through his family connection with Austria. He expressed the belief that the President of the United States would feel much disposed to resist this combined influence on this Continent.²⁰

¹⁶ *The Monroe Doctrine*, pp. 226, 227.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

¹⁸ See *ante*, note 6.

¹⁹ A new constitution—of the unitary type—was adopted July 19, 1826. Rivadavia, who had some months previously been invested with the national executive power, was now named president. See Robertson, *History of the Latin-American Nations*, p. 229.

²⁰ Forbes's memorandum of a conference with Rivadavia. MS. Department of State, Dispatches from Argentina, III.

Forbes replied in such manner as not to commit himself or his government.²¹

A week later, Señor Cruz, minister of foreign affairs, addressed a note to Forbes on the subject. He asked whether the declaration of President Monroe regarding attempts at extension of the European system was or was not applicable to a case in which the emperor of Brazil as king of Portugal might attempt to draw from that kingdom, or from any of the dominions belonging to the crown of Portugal and Algarves, any kind of aid for sustaining the war.²² In reply Forbes pledged himself merely to transmit promptly to his government the substance of the minister's notes.²³

Slowness of communication and the expectation of the arrival of a minister from Buenos Aires to succeed Alvear²⁴ prevented an immediate reply from Washington. In conferences with Forbes, Rivadavia several times called up the subject, desiring to know if an answer to his communication had been received. When he resigned the presidency in July, 1827, he expressed disappointment that no reply to the political questions asked by his government had yet come to Buenos Aires.²⁵

The views of the Washington administration on the relation of the Monroe Doctrine to the Argentine-Brazilian war were expressed in a dispatch which Clay wrote Forbes under date of January 3, 1828. The dispatch in part reads:

. . . The declaration of the late President was that of the head of the Executive Government of the United States. Although there is every reason to believe that the policy which it announced was in conformity with the opinion both of the nation and of Congress, the dec-

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² Robertson, "South America and the Monroe Doctrine", *loc. cit.*, pp. 102, 103.

²³ Forbes to Clay, September 5, 1826. Manning, *Diplomatic Correspondence*, I. 657.

²⁴ See Clay to Forbes, January 3, 1828. MS. Department of State, Instructions to United States Ministers, XII. 49-52.

²⁵ Forbes to Clay, August 20, 1827. MS. Department of State, Dispatches from Argentina, III.

laration must be regarded as having been voluntarily made, and not as conveying any pledge or obligation, the performance of which foreign nations have a right to demand. When the case shall arrive, if it should ever occur, of such an European interference as the message supposes, and it becomes consequently necessary to decide whether this country will or will not engage in war, Congress alone, as you well know, is competent, by our Constitution, to decide that question. In the event of such an interference, there can be but little doubt that the sentiment contained in President Monroe's message, would be still that of the People and Government of the United States. . . .

In respect to the war which has been unhappily raging between the Argentine Republic, and the Emperor of Brazil, the President has seen it with great regret, and would be very glad to hear of its honorable conclusion. But the war cannot be conceived as presenting a state of things bearing the remotest analogy to the case which President Monroe's message deprecates. It is a war strictly American in its origin and its object. It is a war in which the Allies of Europe have taken no part. Even if Portugal and Brazil had remained united, and the war had been carried by their joint arms, against the Argentine Republic, that would have been far from presenting the case which the message contemplated. But, by the death of the late King of Portugal, there has been a virtual separation between the Brazils and Portugal, and during the greater part, if not the whole, of the period of the war, the condition of Portugal has been such as to need succor, rather than be capable of affording it to the Brazils.

The general policy of the United States is that of strict and impartial neutrality in reference to all wars of other Powers. It would be only in an extreme case that they would deviate from that policy. Such a case is not presented by the present war.²⁸

The important points to be noted are the secretary's declaration that only congress could decide whether the United States would enforce the Monroe Doctrine by resort to arms, and his announcement that the government did not consider that Monroe's message contained a pledge which a foreign nation could demand that the United States fulfil.

²⁸ MS. Department of State, Instructions to United States Ministers, XII. 49-52; see also Manning, *Diplomatic Correspondence*, I. 292, 293.

The substance of Clay's dispatch was communicated to the Argentine government by Forbes the following July.²⁷ A month later, peace with Brazil was made on the basis of the independence of the Banda Oriental.²⁸ Consequently, any necessity for the intervention of the United States ceased for the time to exist.

The incident furnished an opportunity to the United States government to interpret President Monroe's declaration. The interpretation—spoken through Clay, chief critic of President Monroe's South American policy—was no doubt in the spirit of the president when he spoke in 1823. But it fell short of the expectations—the hopes at any rate—of the Buenos Aireans and could hardly have the effect of drawing them closer in feeling to the United States. At that time, certainly, the Argentinians could not with justice accuse the United States of a tendency to stretch the meaning of President Monroe's pronouncement.

WATT STEWART.

Stillwater, Oklahoma.

²⁷ Forbes to Rondeau, minister of war and foreign relations, July 9, 1828. Enclosure with dispatch Forbes to Clay, MS. Dispatches from Argentina, III.

²⁸ Forbes to Clay, September 13, 1828. See Manning, *Diplomatic Correspondence*, I. 663.

THE LETTER OF COLUMBUS ANNOUNCING THE SUCCESS OF HIS FIRST VOYAGE

It has been generally assumed that Columbus announced the success of his first voyage in a letter,¹ copies of which were sent by him to the "escribano de ración", Luis de Santangel,² and to Gabriel Sánchez, treasurer of Aragon.³ As the original is lost, and as in the actual text of the versions which have been preserved, no addressee is named, this assumption is not susceptible of complete proof or of complete disproof. There would, however, appear to be good grounds for questioning whether the assumption is justifiable.

Eight versions of the letter have been preserved. Of these, three are complete:

(A)⁴ The folio edition of the Spanish text, printed in 1493, possibly at Barcelona:⁵ in the Lenox Collection of the New York Public Library.

¹ Columbus also sent a letter to Ferdinand and Isabella (*cp.* Ferdinand Columbus, *Historie*, chap. 61: Las Casas, *Historia de las Indias*, I. 77); the original of this letter is lost and no copy remains, although the answer of the sovereigns to it is preserved (*cp.* Navarrete, *Colección de los Viajes*, etc., II. No. XV, pp. 22-23, ed. 1825). The letter preserved bears a close relationship to that sent to the sovereigns (*cp.* De Lollis, *Cristoforo Colombo*, pp. 147-148; ed. 1923), but the theory of Varnhagen (*Carta de Cristóbal Colón*, p. xvii ff.), that the letters were identical, is untenable. Columbus could not have written the first sentence of the extant letter to Ferdinand and Isabella (*cp.* also, "M. K." i.e., Michel Kerney, *The Spanish Letter of Columbus*, Introduction).

² Varnhagen (*op. cit.*, pp. xx-xxi), argued that Sánchez was holding the office of escribano de ración *ad interim*, but there is nothing to support this hypothesis, and there is no doubt that the escribano de ración was Santangel (*cp.* Serrano y Sanz, *Orígenes de la Dominación Española en América*, p. 97 ff.).

³ Cesare de Lollis (*Scritti di Cristoforo Colombo; Raccolta . . . Colombiana*, I. pt. I, p. xxvii), has shown that no distinction can be drawn between the letter described as addressed to the escribano de ración and that described as addressed to Sánchez.

⁴ The letters used to distinguish the different versions are adopted from De Lollis (*Scritti*, I. i, pp. xxv-xxvi).

⁵ De Lollis (*op. cit.*, pp. lvi-lix), discusses the place at which A was printed and points out that various hypotheses are possible. The great argument in

(B) The quarto edition of the Spanish text, printed in 1493, possibly at Naples: in the Ambrosian Library at Milan.

(C) The manuscript copy of the Spanish text, printed in 1825, by Martín Fernández de Navarrete, from a copy made in 1818 by Tomás González.⁶

Two are complete, except for the postscript added after the arrival of Columbus at Lisbon:

(D) The manuscript copy of the Spanish text, from the Colegio Mayor of Cuenca, bought by Varnhagen in 1858 and printed by him in that year.⁷

(I) The Latin translation of Leandro de Cosco, of which nine editions were printed in Italy in 1493-1494.⁸

The three remaining versions are incomplete:

(F) The Italian manuscript translation, in the Ambrosian Library; printed by De Lollis.⁹

(G) The Italian manuscript translation, in the National Library at Florence; printed by De Lollis.¹⁰

(H) Another Italian manuscript translation, also in the National Library at Florence; printed by De Lollis.¹¹

De Lollis¹² has shown that A, B, C, and D are probably all derived from x, a lost copy of the original, D being, perhaps,

favor of printing in Spain appears to be the appearance of the initial rr in such words as *real*, and if the letter were printed in Spain, Barcelona becomes the natural place of printing.

⁶ Navarrete, *op. cit.*, I. 167-175.

⁷ Under the pseudonym, Genaro H. de Volafan, *Primera epistola del Almirante D. Cristóbal Colón*.

⁸ Reprinted by De Lollis, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-134.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. lxxviii-lxx.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. lxx-lxxii.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. lxii-lxxiii. There is further an Italian metrical version by Dati (K), printed at Florence in 1493, which, however, is of no interest for the point under discussion in the present article.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. xxvi ff.

directly so derived,¹³ and A, B, and C being derived indirectly through I, a lost copy of X. He has further shown that while there is a close connection between A and B, the latter cannot be regarded as a mere reprint of the former, but was produced with reference to a manuscript, and that C was derived from a manuscript independently of A and B. The Italian translations, moreover, were not made from the printed Spanish versions, but from manuscripts of which two or more were then circulating in Italy. The original translation of Cosco was made from the same manuscript as G; the later Latin editions were printed without reference to manuscripts. All the extant versions are in some degree inaccurate copies of the original letter, and in any attempt to restore the original text of the letter, almost equal consideration must be given to all the extant versions. In the same way, all these versions must be taken into account in any attempt to determine the addressee of the original letter.

While no addressee is named in the text of any of the extant versions, all, except H, bear indorsements, added by the copyists or translators, descriptive of the document. Of the four Spanish versions, the indorsements of A, B, and C describe the letter as having been sent to the "escribano de ración", that is, to Luis de Santangel; the indorsement of D describes it as having been sent to Gabriel Sánchez. I is described as a letter to Sánchez, although in seven out of the nine editions of Cosco's translation, the name of the treasurer is incorrectly given as Raphael, instead of Gabriel.¹⁴ Of the

¹³ The degree of importance to be attached to D is uncertain. The manuscript used by Varnhagen has since disappeared. When he first printed it, Varnhagen regarded the manuscript as being of the highest importance; he afterward modified his opinion and himself suggested that D was perhaps no more than an attempt to make a correct version of the original letter, errors in earlier copies being corrected in the light of information derived from the *Historie* of Ferdinand Columbus and from the *Historia General* of Herrera, both of which had been published at the date at which D was written. The question of the value of D is admirably discussed by De Lollis (*op. cit.*, pp. li-liii).

¹⁴ The surname also appears as Sanxis, the Aragonese form.

Italian versions, F is described as a copy of a letter written "ad certi consieri", and sent by the treasurer to his brother at Florence;¹⁵ G is described simply as "copia della letera venuta di Spagna".

The evidence concerning the identity of the addressee of the letter, supplied by the indorsements, is thus somewhat unsatisfactory; it is apparently contradictory and perhaps misleading. As they stand, the indorsements suggest that, in addition to his letter to Ferdinand and Isabella, Columbus sent three other letters, one being addressed to Santangel, one to Sánchez, and one, more vaguely, to certain counselors. But when the circumstances in which the letter was written are considered, such reduplication becomes improbable. The letter must have been composed in the course of the return voyage from the Indies, either during the period of fair weather which prevailed from 17 January to 12 February, or during or after the storm which began on 12 February and which reached its height on 14 February.¹⁶ Whichever period be accepted as that during which the letter was written, it would appear that Columbus can have had little leisure for literary composition. During the storm, his attention must obviously

¹⁵ Juan Sánchez, a merchant, resident in Florence.

¹⁶ Harris (*Christophe Colomb*, II. p. 10 ff.), assigned the composition of the letter to the period of the storm; this view is shared by Asensio, Thacher, and others. De Lollis (*op. cit.*, p. xlii), places the date of composition in the earlier period. The date at the end of the letter, 15 February, may be the date of the composition of the whole, and the wording of the letter suggests that, at the time of the writing, Columbus regarded his voyage as completed, which can hardly have been the case until he had sighted land on his return. Further, a passage in the *Journal* (14 February), may indicate that it was the occurrence of the storm which led to the writing of an account of the voyage. This passage, however, is not so conclusive as Thacher (*Christopher Columbus*, II. 4 ff.), supposes and it is hardly probable that it was only then that Columbus thought of preparing some short report of his voyage. It is further unlikely that, during the storm, Columbus, worn out by anxiety and lack of sleep, should have found the time or inclination for writing a letter; the suggestion (*cp.* "M. K.", *op. cit.*), that he spent his sleepless nights in literary composition, appears to be somewhat fanciful. On the whole, the balance of probability seems to be in favor of the view of De Lollis, that the letter was written in the earlier and calm period, and that only the conclusion was written on 15 February.

have been otherwise engaged; during the earlier period of fair weather, he must have devoted no little time to the task of preparing the letter to Ferdinand and Isabella, which was at once more important and also cannot have been less detailed than that which has been preserved. It is also very probable, as Varnhagen suggested, that Columbus was also engaged at that time in casting his "Journal" into shape for presentation to the sovereigns.¹⁷

That there was no such reduplication as the indorsements seem to suggest has, indeed, been generally recognised, and the indorsement on F has accordingly been, in effect, disregarded. It has been supposed that, in addition to the letter to the sovereigns, Columbus sent only two letters, addressing them to Santangel and Sánchez, and that one of these two letters was a copy of the other. This supposition, however, presents certain difficulties.

It is natural enough that Columbus should have taken an early opportunity of informing Santangel that the voyage had been successful; the escribano de ración had done much to make the expedition possible. It is less easy to discover any reason for the selection of Sánchez as an equally early recipient of the news.

His selection has been explained by assuming that Columbus, having gained the support of Santangel with Isabella,

¹⁷ *Carta*, p. xii-xiii. There is evidence that the "Journal" was probably subjected to a certain amount of editing. The letter under consideration is dated "en la caravela, sobre las yslas de Canaria, á .xv. de febrero". At that date Columbus was actually off Santa Maria in the Azores, and unless it be supposed that "Canaria" is an error of the copyist for "Santa Maria", it is clear that when the letter was dated, Columbus was in error concerning his position. In the "Journal" (15 February), it is said that some thought that the land sighted on that day was Madeira, some that it was the rock of Cintra near Lisbon, and that the pilots and sailors thought that it was Castile, but that Columbus himself knew that he was near the Azores. Three days later (*cp.* "Journal", 18 February), a boat was sent ashore and it was learned from the inhabitants of the island that it was Santa Maria. As De Lollis (*op. cit.*, p. xlii), points out, the conflict between the dating of the letter and the statement in the "Journal", suggests that the latter was edited in order to make Columbus appear to have had greater knowledge than the pilots.

was anxious to secure that of Sánchez with Ferdinand.¹⁸ It may be readily admitted that Columbus was anxious to secure all the support which he could obtain in view of a second voyage, but there seems to be no reason for thinking that the support of Sánchez was so valuable as to lead to him being signaled out for the receipt of so special a compliment as that implied by sending to him the first news of the success of the voyage. Sánchez was treasurer of Aragon; the "enterprise of the Indies" was a Castilian concern, and it was from the resources of Castile, not from those of Aragon, that funds would have to be supplied, if they were supplied at all. The supposition that, even so, the support of Ferdinand was of vital importance because he really directed even purely Castilian affairs, can hardly be substantiated; the idea that the king looked coldly on the enterprise is certainly erroneous. But in any case there is no evidence that Sánchez enjoyed any special degree of influence over the mind of the king, or that he had shown any special interest in the project of Columbus.¹⁹ It would have been far more natural for Columbus, if he were seeking an advocate with Ferdinand, to have turned to someone who was known to be especially influential and who had been concerned with the preparations for the first voyage or who had already shown himself to be sympathetic. Such individuals were available. Juan de Coloma, the royal secretary, was a special favorite of the king, and had acted for the sovereigns in drawing up the Capitulations of Santa Fé.²⁰ Diego de Deza was perhaps the king's favorite ecclesiastic and had supported the application of Columbus to the sovereigns. Cardinal Mendoza, whose influence with both Ferdinand and

¹⁸ *Cp.* "M. K.", *op. cit.*

¹⁹ There is no foundation for the story that Sánchez supplied money for the first expedition (*cp.* Serrano y Sanz, *op. cit.*, p. 153). Relatives of Sánchez had been concerned in the murder of the inquisitor Arbués, and the position of the treasurer had been for a time somewhat critical (*cp.* Serrano y Sanz, *op. cit.*, p. 158 ff.). There is, perhaps, here a further argument against the probability of the selection of Sánchez by Columbus as his advocate with the king.

²⁰ *Cp.* Thacher, *op. cit.*, III. 188.

Isabella was so great that he was nicknamed "el tercer rey", had been sympathetic to Columbus before his first voyage. Anyone of these three men, to name no others, would seem to have been better suited than Sánchez to act as the advocate of Columbus with Ferdinand and to have been a more probable choice. The selection of the treasurer of Aragon as one of the two first recipients of the news of the discovery is, indeed, hardly explicable.

On the other hand, if the indorsements represent the fact, it is impossible to suppose that the name of Sánchez has appeared in error and that Columbus actually wrote only to Santangel. While A, B, and C are described as addressed to the escribano de ración, D is described as addressed to Sánchez, and even if the evidence of D be wholly disregarded, as it perhaps should be,²¹ the difficulty remains that neither the Italian nor the Latin versions know anything of Santangel. So far as the indorsement of F can be said to refer to any individual, it is to Sánchez that it refers, while I explicitly describes the letter as having been sent to "eiusdem serenissimi regis thesaurarium" and gives his name. The translator, Cosco, was an Aragonese,²² and it cannot be supposed that he would confuse the offices of escribano de ración and treasurer, while it is very unlikely that he would be ignorant of the name of the treasurer or that, if he did not know it himself, he should not have inquired what it was. It is equally improbable that he should have inserted the name of Sánchez unless the manuscript, from which he worked, gave him some warranty for doing so. It must therefore be concluded that this manuscript bore an indorsement, not exactly represented in G, at least suggesting that the original letter was addressed to Sánchez. Hence, if it be held that Columbus addressed a letter to Santangel, there are equal grounds for holding that he also addressed a letter to the treasurer. The evidence of the in-

²¹ *Cp.*, *supra*, note 13.

²² *Cp.* Serrano y Sanz, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-179.

dorsements is as strong in favor of one supposition as of the other.

The indorsements of F and G, however, suggest an alternative explanation, which appears to solve these difficulties, to be in harmony with the character of the letter itself, and to be in accord with probabilities. It is that Columbus did not address the letter to any specific individual and that, in fact, he did not send the letter directly to any individual or group of individuals.

It must be remembered that the supposition that Columbus wrote directly to Santangel and Sánchez implies that he published the news of his discovery without having first obtained royal authorization to do so. The letters to the escribano de ración and to the treasurer, if sent to them at all, must have been sent at the same time as the letter to Ferdinand and Isabella, and thus before Columbus had communicated with them and received an answer from them. It is true that publication would have been only to officials who might be supposed to be discreet, but even so, to have communicated important information to a subject or subjects as soon as it was communicated to the sovereigns, would have been to act with a certain discourtesy toward Ferdinand and Isabella, and would have been an impolitic act.

In his attitude toward the sovereigns, Columbus never showed himself to be failing in courtesy; if he had a fault in this respect, it was that he was almost too subservient toward them. And if his very character impelled him to consider carefully the susceptibilities of the king and queen, self-interest could at this particular juncture but have impelled him even more strongly in the same direction. If his voyage had in one sense been successful, in another sense it had failed. In this very letter, Columbus betrays his own disappointment that he had found no great cities and no mighty kings. No one can have realized better than he must have realized that the effects of this disappointment might well be disastrous to him; his efforts to secure support for a second voyage, even to

secure that "muy poquita ayuda" for which he pleads in this letter, might well be defeated by those who would urge that the results of the first expedition were not such as to warrant any further drain upon the always scanty resources of the crown. In such circumstances, to have done anything which might have possibly offended the sovereigns and which might thus have inclined them to listen more readily to the opponents of his schemes, would have been in Columbus the very height of folly, and of folly of such a kind he was very unlikely to be guilty. Yet if he had proceeded to make his news known without permission to do so, he would almost certainly have given offense; if the genial temperament of Ferdinand rendered him somewhat careless of his royal dignity, Isabella never forgot that she was a queen and never tolerated anything which could be construed as indicating a lack of respect.²³

Upon other grounds, it was natural that Columbus should hesitate before doing anything which might have the effect of making his news more generally known than it was bound to become known from the mere fact of his return. His experiences during his return voyage at the Azores and at Lisbon must have sufficed to convince him that the Portuguese were at heart hostile and that they were ready, if they could, to appropriate to themselves the fruits of his discovery. Until he had communicated with the sovereigns, he could not know what means they proposed to adopt in order to counter possible Portuguese schemes. It was, however, obvious that royal policy might demand that he should preserve complete silence and that an unauthorized publication of news might prove to prejudice the success of that policy. Had he sent the news of his discovery even to some royal officials, without permission to do so, he would have risked incurring something

²³ That Ferdinand was little insistent, and Isabella very insistent, upon being treated with deference, is amusingly illustrated by the story, possibly authentic, of the queen's dramatic appearance in her nightdress to rebuke some members of the Enríquez family, who were talking familiarly to their relative, the king (*op. Zapata, Miscelanea*, p. 169).

far more serious than the merely temporary displeasure of the queen.

On the other hand, it can hardly be questioned that Columbus must have wished to proclaim his success as soon and as widely as possible. He was certainly not indifferent to fame and he was certainly by no means unwilling to triumph over those who had derided his project. It may be supposed that he was equally anxious to pay to those who had befriended him the compliment of supplying them with early information, that they might not be forced to rely for their knowledge of his achievement upon mere rumor. Columbus was, indeed, in something of a dilemma; he was eager to publish his news and equally eager to avoid doing anything which might prejudice his position with Ferdinand and Isabella. The obvious way of escape from this dilemma was to secure royal sanction for publication, and a closer consideration of the indorsements seems to show that this is precisely what he did, that he prepared the announcement which he wished to be made and submitted it to the sovereigns for their approval.

To the indorsements of A and B, there is added the phrase "contenida á otra de Sus Altezas"; in C, there appears the phrase "é otra de Sus Altezas". The expression has presented some difficulty. Literally it implies that Columbus enclosed his letter to Ferdinand and Isabella in his letter to the escribano de ración, but it is hardly possible that he can actually have done this. It has, indeed, been argued that he was acting with the strictest propriety in transmitting a letter to the sovereigns through the medium of an official, but to this explanation there are apparently two fatal objections. In the first place, it was no part of the functions of the escribano de ración to deal with the correspondence of the sovereigns, and hence Columbus would hardly have selected this particular official as the medium through whom he would communicate with Ferdinand and Isabella. On the contrary, he would naturally have chosen the royal secretary, and the more so since Juan de Coloma had already been concerned with the despatch

of the expedition. In the second place, it seems to be clear that a covering letter to an official, requesting him to transmit a letter to the sovereigns, would have been a merely formal note, would not have entered into any details concerning the voyage, and would have contained some indication of its purpose. The letter, as preserved, has, indeed, none of the characteristics which a covering letter might be expected to have.

The alternative explanation, suggested by the indorsement of C, that the phrase simply means "sent with another letter for their highnesses", is also unsatisfactory. It does not agree with the Spanish of A and B, and there seems to be no obvious reason why such a note should have been added to the indorsement, why, that is, the escribano de razón should have noted that Ferdinand and Isabella received a letter at the same time as he received one.

There is more probability in the suggestion, originally advanced by Varnhagen,²⁴ that the phrase should read "contenida en otra de Sus Altezas", and that the extant letter was in fact enclosed in that to Ferdinand and Isabella. But in this suggestion there is a serious difficulty, if it be supposed that the letter was addressed to Santangel. Columbus was hardly on such terms with the sovereigns that he would have dared, as it were, to commission them to hand on a letter to one of their subjects.

The difficulty disappears, however, if it be held that the letter was not addressed to any specific individual and the action of Columbus then becomes explicable and reasonable. Once more he was anxious that the news of his discovery should be made public and anxious to do nothing which might offend the king and queen. Accordingly, he prepared a letter, that which has been preserved, which might serve as a public announcement of his success. This letter he enclosed in that to Ferdinand and Isabella, presumably with an explanation of its purpose and perhaps with a request that if they saw fit,

²⁴ *Carta*, p. xviii.

the sovereigns should publish it or distribute copies of it to such persons as they might select. He thus secured two objects; the news was ready for publication, the decision whether it should be published was left to the sovereigns, and he was freed from the danger of giving offense by taking it upon himself to decide the matter.

When the text of the letter is examined, it becomes clear that it is just the type of letter which Columbus might in such circumstances be expected to write. It dwells upon the wonders of the newly discovered lands, upon their fertility and mineral wealth, their populousness and extent, thereby suggesting the greatness of the service which Columbus had rendered to the sovereigns. To this extent it supplies a complete answer to those who had declared that his schemes were those of a madman and a complete justification of those who had been his champions. But at the same time the letter gives no information which might not have been gathered from the gossip of the returned sailors. It says nothing of the character of the voyage to the Indies; it gives no clue as to what difficulties had to be met and overcome. It supplies no hint concerning the prevailing winds which were encountered; it says nothing of ocean currents, and it does not state whether the voyage was through shallows or depths. Above all, it gives not the slightest indication of the route which was followed; for all that the letter says, Columbus might have steered north, south, or west. In other words, there is in the letter no information which would be of practical use to any, whether Portuguese or others, who might design to undertake a voyage to the lands which Columbus had discovered. The letter has, indeed, all the characteristics of one of those semi-official announcements which say much and reveal nothing.

It is clear that if the sovereigns did receive such a letter in such circumstances, it was to their interest that its contents should be made known as speedily and as widely as possible. Even if it had been their wish to maintain secrecy, any attempt to do so would have been futile. Columbus had returned and

by the mere fact of his return, the information contained in the letter had become more or less public property and that in the country from which danger was most reasonably to be anticipated. For Columbus had put into Lisbon, and it cannot be supposed that his sailors refrained from talking of the wonders which they had seen or that the Portuguese refrained from asking questions. But since it was thus impossible to conceal the fact that new lands had been discovered, there was an obvious advantage in proclaiming as soon and as widely as possible that of those lands Columbus had taken formal possession in the name of Ferdinand and Isabella. In this way the claim of Castile to dominion over them was asserted immediately and an initial diplomatic advantage was gained in view of a possible dispute with Portugal and in view of possible negotiations at Rome.

There are further indications that it was with Ferdinand and Isabella, and not with Columbus, that the responsibility for publication rested, and that it was by the will of the sovereigns that the letter was made widely known both in Spain and in Italy.

If the indorsements be considered, it appears that they are of the kind which might be expected to be added to copies circulated by royal authority; the recipients were addressed by their titles and not by their names. In the case of A, B, and C, it is certain that this was the case, and that it was the case with the copy sent to Sánchez is suggested by the indorsements of F and I. In the former, the "treasurer" is stated to have sent the letter to his brother, but while the brother's name is given, that of the treasurer is not. In the case of I, the letter is said to have been sent to the "treasurer, Raphael Sánchez". If the name of the treasurer appeared in the manuscript from which Cosco worked, it is hard to see why either he or the printer should have made the gratuitous blunder of substituting "Raphael" for "Gabriel". But if Cosco found only the office of the recipient mentioned in the manuscript, he might quite naturally have added the name for the benefit of

his Italian readers from his own personal knowledge, and that he should have made a mistake concerning the Christian name of the treasurer is not surprising, since in that period the two names "Raphael" and "Gabriel" were frequently confused.

If it be supposed that the recipients of copies of the letter were selected by Ferdinand and Isabella, the appearance of Sánchez among those recipients becomes as readily explicable as the appearance of Santangel. Columbus may well have suggested that if the sovereigns resolved upon publication of the news, a copy of the letter should be given to his friend or patron, the escribano de ración, and to such a suggestion the sovereigns would naturally agree, since the escribano de ración was an important official of the royal household. At the same time, they would also wish that copies should be given to all prominent personages of the court, among whom the treasurer of Aragon would certainly be included.

It may appear to be an objection to this view that if a number of copies were distributed, only indorsements to Santangel and Sánchez should be known. This objection, however, can be readily answered. As De Lollis²⁵ has pointed out, it may be presumed that those who received copies guarded them jealously; their existence would not become generally known and they would remain in the family archives of the recipients; it may be that such copies are still buried somewhere in Spain. On the other hand, while Santangel may be supposed to have guarded his own copy not less jealously, it would have been upon him that Ferdinand and Isabella would have laid the duty of superintending the printing of the letter, since it was the escribano de ración who would be responsible for paying the printer. The printer, receiving a copy indorsed to the escribano de ración, would naturally conclude that the letter was addressed to that official and he would have no means of knowing that copies had been given to other persons. Further, it would be from the copy which was sent

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. xxxix-xl.

to the printer that other copies could most readily be made, which suffices to explain the fact that C, which is not derived from a printed version, bears the same indorsement as A and B.²⁶

That the fact that another copy was given to Sánchez has also been preserved in the indorsements is equally explicable. De Lollis²⁷ has shown that at least two copies of the letter were early circulating in Italy, since while F was translated in the northern, G and H were translated in the central part of the peninsula. But it is most improbable that any recipients of the letter in Spain, who must have been either royal officials, as were Santangel and Sánchez, or at least in contact with the sovereigns, should have sent copies of the letter to a foreign country without royal permission. It is on the other hand very probable that Ferdinand and Isabella were anxious that the news should be circulated in Italy, since it was likely that the question of the ownership of the newly discovered lands would be submitted to the pope and there was an obvious advantage in creating a prior impression that those lands were already Castilian possessions. But if the sovereigns gave instructions that copies should be sent to Italy, the selection of Sánchez, either by them or by Santangel on their behalf, to attend to the transmission of these copies was natural enough. The treasurer was a prominent royal official, was on friendly terms with Santangel and through his brother at Florence had already connections with Italy. The fact that in so far as the Italian and Latin versions of the letter refer to any individual, it is to Sánchez that they refer, is thus explicable; as those who produced the Spanish versions had no knowledge

²⁶ The date of the manuscript of which Tomás González made a copy in 1818 cannot be determined. A note which he added to his copy reads: "Está copiado literalmente del documento original que obra en este Real Archivo de Simancas" (*cp. Navarrete, op. cit.*, I. 175). This note has been taken to mean that González asserted that he had copied the actual letter sent by Columbus, but it is far more probable that it only means that he made an exact copy of the document which he set out to copy, and that he did not mean to assert anything concerning the date of that document or its character.

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. xxvi-xxvii.

of the treasurer as a recipient of the letter, so those responsible for the production of the Italian and Latin versions had no knowledge of the escribano de ración as a recipient. And that only the names of these two officials are preserved as having received the letter is equally explicable; it was only their receipt of copies which became in any sense public knowledge and it was only their copies which were used for purposes of publication and reproduction, other copies remaining purely private possessions.

An objection to this explanation may be urged on the ground of the indorsement of D. But, as already pointed out, the value of D is uncertain, and the fact that it is indorsed to Sánchez seems rather to suggest that it was a compilation from versions already published. A compiler, having I before him as well as A or B, might well conclude either that Sánchez held the office of escribano de ración as well as that of treasurer or that the translator, unable to find a Latin equivalent for escribano de ración, had used the word "tesaurarius". It is by no means improbable that such a compiler should not have known who held the office of escribano de ración in 1493.

Haste is equally suggested by the inaccuracies which mark all extant versions of the letter, no one of which can be an exact copy of the original, and by the character of those inaccuracies. Some of them, such as the reading "veinte" for "xxxiii", are almost obviously the result of hurried misreading of the original manuscript, while one peculiarity of the Spanish versions argues strongly in favor of the view that the letter was rapidly copied by various hands. A contains a number of "Catalanisms";²⁸ B contains about half as many; C has only three and D only two. The variation in the number of "Catalanisms" between A and B has been explained on the

²⁸ For these "Catalanisms", *cp.* De Lollis (*op. cit.*, pp. lxvii-lxviii). Some of them may possibly be really "Italianisms"; it may be noted that the Genoese dialect of the period was certainly akin to Catalan. Señor Luis Ulloa (*Xristo-Ferens Colom*, p. 64 ff.), has suggested that their appearance in A and B is due to the fact that the original letter was written by Columbus in Catalan; the arguments by which he endeavors to support this hypothesis are hardly deserving of serious refutation.

assumption that A was printed at Barcelona, and that the Catalan compositor could not read the original with any ease, and that the printer of B corrected A as far as he was able to do so.²⁹ But, quite apart from the fact that it is not certain that A was printed at Barcelona, a more reasonable explanation of the appearance of these "Catalanisms" and of the variation in their number is that they are the result of the fact that the original manuscript was copied by various hands. On this assumption, they are readily explicable. The manuscript copy from which A was printed was made by a Catalan clerk; it is natural enough that a Catalan clerk should be employed at Barcelona. The manuscript copy to which the printer of B referred was made by another clerk, also a Catalan, but better acquainted with Castilian or better able to read the original handwriting. The manuscript copy from which C was derived, and that from which D was derived, if D be anything more than a compilation from printed versions, were made by non-Catalan clerks; it is noteworthy that two of the three "Catalanisms" in C³⁰ and both those in D are place-names.

Finally, the letter as preserved is certainly an edited version of the original and there is reason for thinking that the editing was by royal order, since to the original one addition has been made which could not have been made without permission from the sovereigns. In A, B, and C the signature "El Almirante" appears, while in I this signature is elaborated into "Cristoforus Colom, oceanee classis prefectus", which indicates that some signature equivalent to that in A and B appeared in the manuscript, from which Cosco translated. But neither the one signature nor the other can possibly have appeared in the original.³¹ Apart from the fact

²⁹ De Lollis (*loc. cit.*), has shown that there are "Catalanisms" in B which are not in A, which argues against the explanation put forward concerning the printing of A and B.

³⁰ The third is "Sant" for "San".

³¹ The signature to I is obviously the work of the translator since it is absurd. A Castilian admiral was not the admiral of a fleet, but of an area, at that period;

that in all his extant writings Columbus never once uses his name as a signature, he could not have described himself as "El Almirante" in February, 1493, in a letter written before he had reached Lisbon and intended to meet the eye of a royal official, if not that of the queen herself. For the title was not his to use. By the Capitulations of Santa Fé and by the formal agreement of Granada, he was indeed, promised that he should receive that title if his expedition were successful, but it was not formally conferred upon him until the agreement of Granada was confirmed at Barcelona after his return, and it is not used in any document dating before he had reached Spain after his first voyage.³² Had Columbus assumed the title before it had been really granted to him, he would certainly have given offense to the queen and he would as certainly have supplied his enemies with a ground for attack upon him as an upstart foreigner. He cannot have used it until at least he was implicitly authorized to do so by the fact that the sovereigns so addressed him in their answer to his letter announcing his return. The signature to A, B, and C must therefore have been added to the original letter and that by royal command, which is a further argument in favor of the view that this letter was not specifically addressed to any individual, but was of the nature of a draft circular letter enclosed in the letter to Ferdinand and Isabella for their approval.

It may, then, be concluded that Columbus did not write either to Santangel or to Sánchez, and that the fact is most nearly represented by the indorsement to F, in the sense that copies of his letter were distributed by the sovereigns "ad certi consieri".

CECIL JANE.

London, England.

as Fadrique Enríquez was "almirante de Castilla", so Columbus became "almirante del mar oceano". The title had no necessary connection with the command of ships.

³² *Cp.* the documents in Navarrete, *op. cit.*, II. 7 ff. In a cédula of 30 April, 1492, for example, Columbus is described as being sent on a voyage "como nuestro capitan", not as "como nuestro almirante".

DOCUMENT

DEED OF EMANCIPATION OF A NEGRO WOMAN SLAVE, DATED MEXICO, SEPTEMBER 14, 1585

This interesting and unique instrument is an indication merely of the wealth of treasure to be found in the remarkable assemblage of legal documents included in the priceless collections of sixteenth century Mexican and Peruvian manuscripts presented to the Library of Congress a year ago by Mr. Edward S. Harkness of New York, which he has recently supplemented with a further valuable gift of Mexican and Peruvian manuscripts covering the same period. The documents in the first Mexican collection are largely legal in character and comprise the original papers in cases in civil and criminal law involving Hernando Cortés and other conquistadores and their heirs and successors. In addition to being a mine of information to the student of legal history and comparative law, they furnish a wealth of material on the social, political, and economic development of New Spain, brought out in the oftentimes lengthy testimony of the litigants and witnesses examined in the course of the suits.

This particular deed of emancipation chances to be a notary's copy, although practically the whole collection of manuscripts is made up of the original papers as evinced by the signatures and rubrics. The deed is written on parchment in a fair hand, unusually clear and legible for the period, and was submitted as evidence in a lawsuit brought in Mexico in 1585 by the Marqués del Valle, son of the conqueror Hernando Cortés, for the possession of the slave described in the deed.

From the papers in the case it appears that after the death of a certain Diego Pérez de Algaba, who had held the position of factor and majordomo on the estate of the Marqués del Valle, suit was instituted against his widow, Doña Inéz de

León to recover the negro slave Juana and her two children. The representative of the Marqués claimed that Juana was the property of the Marqués, born of slave parents belonging to the Marqués on his sugar plantation of Tlaltenango in Cuernavaca; and that some twenty years previous during the absence of the Marqués in Spain, his servant and factor, Diego Pérez de Algaba had taken the slave into his own service and kept her there despite repeated attempts on the part of the Marqués's agents to recover the slave or persuade Diego Pérez to pay for her.

Doña Inéz, on the other hand, claimed the slave as part of her husband's estate, asserting that after the Marqués had gone back to Spain, the slave Juana had originally been sold by a duly authorized agent of the Marqués to the latter's brother, Don Martín Cortés, who had her in his service for about a year and then on his departure for Spain in 1567 or 1568, had resold her to the defendant's husband, the amount paid in each sale being two hundred pesos *de oro de minas*. Doña Inéz also declared that Juana had remained in her husband's service from the time he purchased her until his death with the full knowledge and concurrence of the agents of the estate of the Marqués del Valle and that the children in question were born during this period and that therefore they too formed a part of her husband's estate.

After some nine months of litigation, the provincial judge (an oidor of the audiencia) before whom the case was being tried, gave a decision in favor of the Marqués, and the case was appealed to the audiencia of Mexico. At this juncture, Juana appears before the court with her deed of emancipation dated shortly after the suit was instituted, and petitions that she be protected in the enjoyment of the freedom which she has purchased.

The case then assumes a triangular aspect, the Marqués's counsel denying the validity of the deed, and Doña Inéz, on the demand of Juana's counsel, being obliged to deposit the two hundred pesos *de oro de minas* which she had received

from the slave until the suit should be decided. Unfortunately for the reader's curiosity, the final judgment in the suit is missing from the papers, although the indications are that it was decided in favor of the Marqués.

It is an open question whether Juana and her husband, whom the evidence establishes as a slave belonging to Don Luis de Castilla, thought they were engaging in a bona fide transaction in purchasing her freedom, or whether they were party to the ruse, evidently advanced to delay proceedings in the case.

The deed of emancipation, however, is just as interesting an historical exhibit, not many such documents seeming to have been preserved, although authorities agree that the purchase of emancipation by negro slaves was sufficiently common in New Spain throughout the colonial period. It was probably particularly so at the time of our documents since in the period following the epidemic of 1545 in which over 800,000 Indians are estimated to have perished,¹ negro slaves were imported for labor in increasingly large numbers until in 1560 they outnumbered the Spanish.² Emancipation by purchase was possibly regarded as a feasible method of exacting a maximum of work from the negro during his prime and evading the expense of supporting him when he ceased to be so useful. In any event as early as 1526 there was a decree permitting the negro to purchase his liberty by payment of not less than twenty *marcos de oro*. It also seems to have been customary to make such disposition of slaves in testamentary documents, the will of D. Fernando de Villagómez, bishop of the *puebla* of Los Angeles, dated November 23, 1570, providing that his

¹ Bancroft, *History of Mexico*, II. 529.

² Aiton (*Antonio de Mendoza*, Durham, 1927, p. 100, quoting "Relaciones geográficas de Nueva España", *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas*, Sevilla, VII. nos. 36, 37, 45, 46) says: "The earliest census figures, those of February 25, 1560, show New Spain in its widest extent to have had a population, at that date, of 13,180 Spaniards, 15,609 negroes, 2,425 mestizos, and 1,465 mulattoes, besides 3,000 Spaniards of unfixed habitation and 3,000 in Guatemala, Costa Rica, and Honduras".

negro slave María, whom he had brought from the kingdom of Castille, should be freed on her payment to the church of 200 pesos *de oro común*.³ The document and its translation into English follow.

STELLA RISLEY CLEMENCE.

Library of Congress.

CARTA DE LIBERTAD

SePan quantos Esta carta Vieren como yo Dona Ynes de leon Muger que fui de Diego Perez de algaua difunte vezina desta gran ciudad de MeXico de la nueba España Por lo Que me toca E como Persona Que Estoy En Posesion de Juana negra mi Esclaua Por lo Que toca a mi docte y arras digo que Por Quanto yo he tenido E tengo Por mi Esclaua abida de buena guerra a la dha Juana mi Esclaua criolla desta tierra la qu^al me a dado E Pagado Por Que le de libertad do cientos Ps^o de oro de mynas En Reales En Esta manera los do cientos E treinta Ps^o de oro comun En rreales de Plata y El rresto Qun-Plimimiento a la dicha contia en vna caXa dea misde⁴ y de oro con vna cadena Menuda de siete bueltas y otra caXa dea misde⁴ y de oro E dos medallas de oro Que Pesaron vn marco aPresçiado En los cien Ps^o e siete tomynes rrestantes todo lo qu^al Por la dha Juana negra y Andres morena su marido se me dio E Pago En Presencia del Presente Escriuano desta escritura a quien Pido de fee dela qu^al Paga y Entrega yo El dho Escriu^o yusoEscrto doy fee Que se hizo E Paso En mi Presençia E de los testigos desta Escritura y los Rescibio la dicha doña Inez de leon E yo la sobre dicha ansi lo digo E confieso E ansi Por la dicha Paga Que me haze como Por los buenos Servicios que la dicha Juana negra mi Esclaua me a hecho e buena Boluntad Que le tengo a Ella y al dicho su marido En aquella Via E forma que de derecho mejor lugar aya de mi ProPia libre E agradable Boluntad sin Premio ni fuerça otorgo E conosco Por Esta Presente carta Que ahorro E liberto E saco de todo cautiberio sujeçion E serbidumbre a la dha Juana negra criolla mi Esclaua e Quiero Que sea libre agora y En todo tpo E no sujeta a serbidumbre E como t^al Pueda andar y ande Por las partes E lugares que quisiere E Paresca En Jui^o E cobre

³ Agustin Alcalá y Henke, *La Esclavitud de los negros en la América española (tesis doctoral)*, (Madrid, 1919), p. 72.

⁴ Manuscript not clear, conjectural reading.

E rresciba sus bienes y los rrega y admynystre E haga testamentos E codescilios E nonbre herederos y albaceas E haga E disponga de su Persona todo aquello que una Pers^a libre nascida de Padres libres puede E deue hazer E me obligo de aber por buena Esta escritura E que se guardara E Qunplira y abra y tendra Efeto Esta libertad E yo ni otro Por mi contra Ella se yra in berua E si se fuere o viniere ne me bala E demas de que dara Prouada E rrealidadada Le dare E pagare E Boluere los doz[ien]tos Ps^o de oro que ansi me a dado E Pagado por su libertad Para lo qu^{al} que dicho es obligo mi Persona E bienes abidos E por aber E doy Poder Qunplido a las Just^{as} E Juezes de su mag de qualesquier Partes que sean alfuero de Juredicion de las Quales E de cada vna dellas y Espeçial y Espresam^{te} a las Just^{as} desta dha ciudad de MeX^{co} y a la avdiencia Real y alcaldes de corte que en ella Residen donde me someto rrenunciando El myo Propio E la ley sit convenerit de Juredicione onivn Judicum Para q^{las} dhas Just^{as} me conPelan a lo que dho es como Por es Pasado en cossa Juzgada E rrenun^o las Leyes e derechos de mi fabor E lo general del derecho E Por ser muger renu^o las leyes de los EnPeradores Justeniano E Beliano E la nueba constitucion E leyes de Toro E Partida E las demas de mi fabor q es ff^o En MeX^{co} a catorçe dias del mes de setienbre de myll E qui^{os} E ochenta E cinco a^{os} siendo ts^o El doctor Dionigio der ribera Ellic^{do} Esteuan Porras Relator de la rreal avdiencia desta ciudad E Jn^o A^o l v^{os} y estantes En Esta dha ciudad y la otorg^e a quien yo El Escriu^o doi fee que conosco lo firmo de su n^e / Dona ynes de leon Paso ante mi Alonso Ssantillan Escriu^o de su mag va entregado diz de oro comun vala

Yo A^o Santillan escriu^o de su mag Rl fui presente e fize my Sg^o [hay un signo] en Verdadr testimo^o Al^o Santillan.

[TRANSLATION]

LETTER OF FREEDOM

[DEED OF EMANCIPATION]

Know all men who see this letter that I, Doña Inez de Leon, former wife of Diego Perez de Algaba, deceased, and a resident of this great city of Mexico in New Spain, so far as what concerns me and, as the person in possession of the negro woman, my slave Juana, so far as

what concerns my dowry and *arras*;⁵ declare that inasmuch as I have held and hold as my slave, obtained by fair and lawful means, the said my slave Juana, a negro woman born in this country; who to the end that I liberate her, has given and paid me [the sum of] two hundred pesos *de oro de minas* in *reales* in the following way: two hundred and thirty pesos *de oro común*⁶ in silver *reales*, and to complete the aforementioned sum a box of gold alloy⁷ with a slender chain of seven strands, another box of gold alloy,⁷ and two gold medals weighing eight ounces, these articles being valued at a hundred pesos [*do oro común*] and seven tomines over; all which was given and paid me by the said negro woman Juana and Andrés Moreno, her husband, in presence of the notary of this present instrument, whom I ask to bear witness thereof:⁸ Wherefore in consideration of the payment which she has made me and for the further consideration of the good service which the negro woman, my slave Juana, has rendered me and the good will that I bear her and the said her husband; in the best legal manner and form, and of my own free and gracious will, without constraint or compulsion, I do declare and acknowledge by this present letter that I emancipate, set free, and release from all captivity, subjection, and servitude the said my slave Juana, creole negro woman. And it is my will that she shall be free now and for all time, and not subject to servitude. And as such person she may and shall go in whatever parts and places she desires; and may appear in judgment and collect and receive her property and manage and administer her estate; and may make wills and codicils and name heirs and executors; and may act and dispose of her person in whatsoever a free

⁵ Eseriche (*Diccionario*) defines the nuptial *arras* as the sum promised by the husband to the wife by reason of the marriage in remuneration for her dowry, virginity, or nobility, and which may not exceed one-tenth of the value of the husband's property.

⁶ At this time the peso *de oro de minas* was valued at 450 *maravedis*; the peso *de oro común* at 300 *maravedis*. See C. H. Haring, *HISP. AMER. HIST. REV.*, II, 177.

⁷ *Ante*, note 4.

⁸ In the manuscript the notary's attestation of the payment and Doña Inez de Leon's confirmation follow, inserted in the text as written by the notary. This interpolated matter which should properly have been in the margin is as follows: "Which payment and transfer, I, the said notary, undersigned, bear witness was made in my presence and that of the witnesses of this instrument, and that the said Doña Inez de Leon received it. And I, the aforementioned [Doña Inez de Leon] do hereby declare and acknowledge this."

person, born of free parents may and must do. And I bind myself to regard this instrument as valid, and that it shall be kept and fulfilled, and this freedom held and considered inviolate; and that neither I, nor any other in my behalf, shall speak against her; and that her going and coming shall be a matter of indifference to me. And more, if I fail in this and it be proved and confirmed, I will give and pay and return to her the two hundred pesos de oro that she has herewith given and paid me for her liberty. For the aforesaid, I pledge my person and the property which I now possess or shall possess. And I give full authority to his majesty's justices and judges, in any place whatsoever within the jurisdiction of any and all of them, and especially and expressly to the justices of this city of Mexico and to the royal audiencia and the court justices who reside therein, wherein I submit myself, renouncing my own [jurisdiction] and the law *sit convenerit de jurisdictione omnium judicum*—to the end that these judges may constrain me to what is herein contained, as if decreed by them in court. And I renounce the laws in my favor, and my right, and the general right, and as a woman I renounce the laws of the emperors Justinian and Valerian, and the new constitution, and the laws of Toro and Partidas, and any others in my favor. Dated in Mexico, the fourteenth day of the month of September, fifteen hundred and eighty-five. Being witnesses: Doctor Dionysio de Rivera, Licenciado Estevan Porras, *relator* of the royal audiencia of this city, and Juan Alonso, citizens, residing in this city. Signed by the maker of this deed, whom I, the notary, affirm that I know = Doña Inez de Leon. Done before me, Alonso Santillan, his majesty's notary. Inserted: *de oro comun*.

I, Alonso Santillan, his royal majesty's notary, was present and affix my sign [there is a notorial sign] in true testimony. Alonso Santillan.

COMMUNICATIONS

To the Editor of the *HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW* :

Sir :

Any one who presumes to write in the field of contemporary history must be prepared to encounter controversy and sharp criticism. His researches, however extended, can not be so profound as to exhaust materials that ultimately may see the light of day. And interpretations, however judiciously framed, can not be expected to command the agreement of men as well informed whose assumptions, social philosophy, and manners may be different.

When I was invited by a committee of publicists and scholars to make an investigation of our economic relations with Cuba, I discussed the possibilities with an eminent eastern historian. "They want me to bring back the facts", I commented. "But I know the views of many of these men. They expect that I will find something discreditable in our policy. Suppose I do not. That would be embarrassing." "But suppose you do," retorted my adviser.

Prepared to be embarrassed, whatever came of it, I dug into the facts, selected those which seemed to hang together in a significant and relevant sequence, and found that they supported serious reflections upon some phases of our policy, that they compelled recognition of the inevitability of other phases, and that they wholly contradicted some views to which members of my committee had given previous utterance in public. I wrote up my material in what seemed appropriate form, presented my manuscript, and was requested only to reduce its length. The resulting manuscript was published, with negligible editorial changes, as *Our Cuban Colony. A Study in Sugar*. As such it has called forth a review in your columns signed by Professor Charles E. Chapman, which I would not feel called upon to notice were it not that it contains expressions which can be construed as an attack upon my intellectual integrity. Professor Chapman's notions that "an indictment of the United States and Americans generally" is an outstanding characteristic of the book, that I am biased, prejudiced, a rhetorician, given to innuendo, unfamiliar with Spanish and a Democrat, I may safely leave to those of your

readers who may be sufficiently interested to refer to my book. But the suggestion that I have not set forth in this work to the best of my ability those things which I believe to be true and have sought adequately to verify, I must repudiate as wholly false, unwarranted, and malicious.

I am obliged to Professor Chapman, however, for pointing out sundry typographical errors, and for the zeal with which he has sought, but not found, my errors of fact. The one specific factual error which he alleges becomes such only by a misquotation upon his part which wholly distorts the meaning of my original sentence. I can not suppose Professor Chapman to be so naïve as to be seriously distressed at the lack of patriotism involved in speaking of the blood-thirstiness of our antebellum Congress. And I can suppose only that the excitement of the 1928 campaign prompted his curious idea that I had written a Democratic campaign tract, and enabled him to overlook my sundry encomiums of Wood, Root, Roosevelt, and even, in part, of Crowder, or my "bitter" comments upon A. Mitchell Palmer and other sterling Democrats. Reviewers have accused me in the course of uniformly cordial criticisms of being everything from a radical to a new and dangerously subtle tool of Wall Street. But I really, really, do not deserve to be called a Democrat. I am only one of the happily increasing number of Americans who feel that political criticism, like charity, properly begins at home.

LELAND H. JENKS.

Rollins College.

To the Editor of the *HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*:

Sir:

I have just read Mr. Jenks's comment on my review of his book, *Our Cuban Colony*. His communication has the ring of an honest emotion, such as a worth-while young man might feel over criticism of his first work on an important subject. The present writer recalls a similar heart-burning over his own first book, and may assure Mr. Jenks that he, too, will probably become a little more "case-hardened" in future.

To come to the point. To say that I was "malicious" in condemning certain phases of his book is ridiculous, as I did not know the slightest thing about Mr. Jenks beyond what appears in his volume.

To me he was purely and simply "Mr. X". I wrote my review on the same basis that Mr. Jenks claims for his book, "setting forth to the best of my ability those things which I believed to be true". Furthermore, I still believe them to be true, and perhaps it is well for the peace of mind of Mr. Jenks that he did not see certain letters I received in which the characterizations of his work were somewhat more harsh than those I made.

And yet if he will re-read my review in a calmer frame of mind, he will find that there is some praise. Diligence, thoughtfulness, and a high degree of ability the book undoubtedly does show. And I do not in the least mean to imply any inherent dishonesty in Mr. Jenks. Young men in their first great "investigation" of their country's activities are prone to discover and to weep over evils; to give Jenks credit, however, he did not weep. His work shows promise of fine scholarship, and it is no great crime to be young.

Just one more word. I did not specifically "accuse" Mr. Jenks of being a Democrat, though his probable sympathies in that direction were pointed out as rather apparent. My own political record in presidential elections is at present two out of every three votes for the Democratic candidates. And I even thought of voting for Al Smith, until I heard him over the radio. I do not care whether Jenks is "a sterling Democrat", a Republican, or an Anarchist, but as a reviewer I feel that I am within my province in denouncing what appeared to me to be a too evident manifestation of party prejudice, at the risk of distortion of subject-matter.

CHARLES E. CHAPMAN.

University of California at Berkeley.

To the Editor of the HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW:

Sir:

Since Professor Chapman repudiates any intention to imply insincerity on my part, I beg to assure him that the adjective "malicious" was expressly limited to such sentences in his review as seemed to suggest that he meant to do so.

LELAND H. JENKS.

Rollins College.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Coming of the White Man, 1492-1848. [A History of American Life: Volume I]. By HERBERT INGRAM PRIESTLEY. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929. Pp. xx, 411. Illus. \$4.00.)

This book is Volume I. of a series whose reputation has already been established by the publication of other volumes. While the execution of the general plan conceived by Professors Schlesinger and Fox presented many difficulties, it seems safe to assume that none of the collaborators had a harder task than Professor Priestley. *A History of American Life* is a synthetic work, it belongs to the newer type of historical writing, and it may be described roughly as a social history of the United States. Social history is so comprehensive a thing that it includes almost everything from kitchen stoves to kitchen cabinets, and yet as it is now conceived it is so new a thing that there is relatively little monographic material available for synthesis. Although there has been a vast deal of writing about ways of life, most of it is the work of untrained hands, and the social historian of today must be as wary of it as a sociologist grappling with a missionary's account of tribal customs in the Zulu Islands. To take this amorphous mass of materials and give it significant form was no easy matter for any of the collaborators. In addition to this difficulty, which arises out of the very nature of the enterprise, Professor Priestley was confronted by a problem peculiar to his part in the undertaking, which was to give an account of life in the Spanish, French, and Dutch colonies of North America. Here was a subject that not only lacked obvious unity but also required the writer to prove to many a doubting Thomas that such a study has a place in a history of life in the United States. Professor Priestley's success in this arduous undertaking marks him as an unusually gifted historian. None will appreciate the extent of his achievement more fully than his fellow workers in the Hispanic American field.

The character of the book is indicated and its place in the series justified by the editors' statement in their Foreword that it was designed to furnish "standards of comparison" for the study of life in the United States. The design is apparent throughout the book, most

of all in the analysis of Spanish and French colonial life, which are studied not so much in the regions that have become a part of the United States as at their focal points, which were respectively New Spain and Canada. This method entails the omission of much that one would like to know, for Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and even California receive rather scant attention; but given the purpose of the volume the majority of readers will probably agree that the method is sound. The consequences of its application can be seen most easily by comparing the relevant portions of the present work with Professor Bolton's *The Spanish Borderlands*. It is no disparagement of either work to say that they differ even more widely from each other than does *A History of American Life* from *The Chronicles of America*.

Since it was designed to serve as a basis for comparison, this book should be read in conjunction with the two volumes of this series dealing with the English colonies. The reader is expected to make his own comparisons, but Professor Priestley has provided him with many useful hints. The most valuable of these, in the reviewer's opinion, is his brief analysis of the various colonial land systems and their consequences. He says (pp. 228-229):

In Spanish and French America alike, land proprietorship became unavailable to the small worker—in New France because the seigneurs monopolized it; in New Spain because irrigable land was limited and because the system of forced labor encouraged the patriarchal institution. So the "hardy-pioneer" type, characteristic of the English frontier, was less frequent in the two Latin areas because free land did not exist.

Again we read (p. 37), that "the formation of a large element of 'hardy pioneers' " in New Spain was hampered by "the conditions of rural life, the nature of the frontier and the character of the lower classes". These suggestions point the way to a study that would be of great value. The significance of the frontier in American (that is, United States) history would be made clearer by an appraisal of its significance in Spanish American history.

While the chapters on New France and New Netherland are illuminating, they are not of the same quality as those that deal with New Spain. Here the author is perfectly at home. He writes with the authority that comes from long study and with a sympathy that is tempered by understanding. He knows his Spaniards too well to

romanticize about them. While his book provides a complete refutation of the calumnies long directed against Spain, he has not made the mistake of substituting one emotional attitude for another, of attempting to correct calumny by adulation. It is true that like older writers he compares the Spaniards with other Europeans in America—that is indeed the chief purpose of his book, as we have already said—but whereas their antithesis was vice and virtue, his is adjustment and maladjustment. The subject of his study is not morals but functions, and his object is to show what was and how it came about. While he writes with detachment his work does not thereby lose human interest, for his detachment is not Olympian but scientific.

In other words, Professor Priestley has brought to the performance of his difficult task precisely the equipment that was needed. Breadth of vision, depth of knowledge, and the detachment of the critical spirit have made his chapters on New Spain an invaluable contribution to historical knowledge. Some of the chapters (IV. "Economic Life in New Spain", V. "The Wards of the Spaniards", VI. "Spanish Colonial Life and Letters", and VII. "The Last Cycle of New Spain") are little masterpieces. These contain admirable descriptions of the diversified economic life of New Spain, with its fabulous mineral wealth, its mining code that became the basis of the mining laws of the United States, its agriculture whose products were more valuable than those of the mines, and its varied manufactures; of the Indians, who were tortured with the kindness of Christianity; of a flourishing culture that was half a century old at the birth of Jamestown; and of the fresh impulse given to colonial life by the Bourbon reforms of the eighteenth century. This portion of the book is fused with the others and unity achieved through the use of the comparative method.

One occasionally encounters obscure or dubious passages. The statement that "the Spaniards were not the only gold-thirsty men who labored under the misconceptions of the mercantilist theory of economics" (p. 10) is misleading, for it occurs in a chapter dealing with the sixteenth century, and Professor Haring has shown that Spanish policy was not guided at that time by the mercantilist theory. The allusion to "the inflexibility of the Spanish colonial ideal" (p. 138) seems hardly justifiable in view of the extensive modification of the colonial system which was effected under Charles III. and of which Professor Priestley himself gives a brief account. Nor can one subscribe to his statement that "the principal weakness, after all the

notable reforms of Charles III., was his failure to raise up a worthy successor in his son" (p. 208)—a statement that is neither convincing in itself nor in harmony with what seems to be Professor Priestley's interpretation of history.

The character of this review has been determined by the character of the book under consideration. If we have dealt mainly in generalities, it is because the book is doubly a pioneer work, and its novelty necessitates an inquiry into its implications. Despite its pioneer character, Professor Priestley has done his work so well that it will stand the ravages of time and his fellow historians better than most pioneer performances. Numerous illustrations and a critical bibliography add considerably to its value. There can be little doubt that for a long time to come both the specialist and the general reader will turn to this book for the most authoritative and most enlightening account of life in the Spanish colonies of North America.

"This is the way that history ought to be written", said an enthusiastic reviewer of one of the earlier volumes of this series. Without being dogmatic we may at least say of the present volume, "This is one way that history ought to be written."

ARTHUR P. WHITAKER.

Western Reserve University.

The Luna Papers. Documents relating to the Expedition of Don Tristán de Luna y Arellano for the Conquest of La Florida in 1559-1561. Translated and edited with an historical Introduction by HERBERT INGRAM PRIESTLEY, Ph.D. 2 vols. (DeLand: The Florida State Historical Society, 1928. Portrait; map, facsimiles. To Members of The Florida State Historical Society, \$36.00.)

This work of prime sources is No. Eight of the publications of The Florida State Historical Society. Like all other publications of that Society, it does not enter into general trade, the edition being limited to 360 copies, three hundred of which go to the members, while the other copies are held for emergency uses. A few copies might be sold outside the membership but at an advanced price. The volumes were printed by the Yale University Press under the direction of Carl Purington Rollins, and in all respects conform to the best canons of printing and book making. With their excellent typography, hand-made paper, and attractive, durable binding, *The Luna Papers*, from

the standpoint of bookmaking rank easily among the foremost publications of 1928.

Judged from the standpoint of scholarship, these volumes take very high rank. Dr. Priestley, who is professor of Mexican History and Librarian of the famous Bancroft Collection at the University of California at Berkeley, brought to his task that peculiar equipment that is necessary for the translating and editing of works of this nature—a thorough knowledge of the rich Spanish language and a rare understanding of Spanish colonization.

The documents composing the volumes are presented in the original Spanish—in which the peculiarities of the original manuscripts have been preserved—with a page-for-page translation into English. Of the twelve main documents, the first eight are from the Archivo General de Indias, the ninth from Buckingham Smith's *Colección de varios Documentos para la Historia de La Florida y Tierras adyacentes* (London, 1857), and the last three from the Lowery and B. Smith papers in the New York Historical Society. In their totality, the documents give an excellent account of the Luna Expedition, which has hitherto been known mainly and very inadequately through the incomplete account given by the Dominican Fray Agustín Davila Padilla (not a participant) which was first published in 1596, over thirty years after the expedition took place. This account is, therefore, a contribution to historical knowledge of no small moment.

The documents show that Luna's expedition, notwithstanding that it ended in a fiasco, was remarkable for several reasons:

1. The expedition was forced on Spain (as were other colonial measures) by fear lest other European nations—France especially—preempt the northern lands and so, have easy access to the sources of Spanish wealth, namely Mexico and Peru.

2. It marked, even more fully and clearly than did the Coronado expedition, the change in colonial methods from the purely conquistador type (exemplified in the Cortes, Soto, and other expeditions) to one fitted out in large measure by royal funds.

3. It was prepared under the personal supervision of the viceroy of Mexico, who spared no pains to make it a success.

4. The viceroy, in various letters to Luna y Arellano, stated clearly his ideas on colonization and what he expected to be realized by this expedition. In fact, his letters form one of the clearest expositions of Spanish colonial aims held by some persons of influence that have ever been set forth, and quite give the lie to assertions that all Spanish colonization theory and practice were lacking in proper economic bases.

5. The ends to be accomplished by the expedition were: (a) The establishment of a Spanish base on or near the Gulf of Mexico by means of which easy contact could be maintained with Mexico; (b) the establishment of a fortified settlement at Punta de Santa Elena, which would command the Bahama Channel and prevent attacks by other European nationals and pirates on the treasure ships sailing to Cuba and Spain as well as on other Spanish shipping; (c) the establishment of real economic centers based on the family.

That the expedition proved a failure was no fault of Viceroy Luis de Velasco who counted much upon it for the aggrandizement of Spain and Mexico. The failure came about through several contributing factors, among which may be noted: the buffetings of nature; the ill health of the leader who was worn out with his many labors in new lands (he had been *maestre de campo* of the Coronado expedition, and had taken a principal part in that enterprise); the character of many members of the expeditionary corps who were quite unfitted for life in the new lands; the lack of coöperation manifest at nearly every stage; the mistake in taking women and children into Florida until after a settlement had been effected; lack of food supplies and of proper communications with Mexico; the conditions of the country itself; and, as might be expected, the Indians. In his weakened condition, the leader was not the man to hold his officers and men, and when a suit to compel him to return to Mexico was initiated the beginning of the end was seen and the enterprise was doomed. Ángel de Villafañe, who superseded Luna y Arellano in the command, failed to bring about the desired end, and when the foreign danger seemed to have passed, the attempt to establish bases in Florida ceased for the time being, not again to be renewed until the Huguenot episode sent another leader of a different stamp into Florida—Pedro Menéndez de Avilés.

Had the expedition succeeded, there would have been no Huguenot attempts to found settlements along the Atlantic coast of North America unless possibly in a much more northerly latitude, no massacre by Menéndez, perhaps, indeed, no founding of St. Augustine. With the failure of the enterprise, Spanish attempts about the region now known as Pensacola ceased for many years, not to be resumed, indeed, until another fear of foreign aggression forced a renewal of attention to the district. The Huguenot attempts were to force the founding of St. Augustine before half a decade had passed.

Thanks to the lawsuit against Luna y Arellano, and to Luna's memorial of his services, we have a pretty full account of the expedition, for many of the letters, decrees, petitions, and the demands and counterdemands of the suit were duly entered in the expedientes which comprise the first two and most voluminous documents of the volumes. A short preface by the editor in Volume I. (pp. ix-xv) presents various data relative to the method of treatment and the known materials of the expedition; and the historical introduction (I. xix-lxvii) reviews the leading events of the expedition forming a most valuable exposition of the whole episode. The introduction should be read carefully before reading the documents themselves.

The translation of the documents was not easy, because of the archaic forms, the crabbed Spanish, and the peculiarities of the original manuscripts, but Professor Priestley has succeeded, not only in making an excellent translation, but in making the reading of the documents interesting. Little exception can be taken to any of the renderings. Mr. G. R. G. Conway, of Mexico City, points out in a letter to the reviewer that the passage referring to the age of Luna's son Carlos (I. 125, lines 9-11 from the end) there rendered "Don Carlos is not old enough to marry at only eight years of age without doing him great injury" should read "Don Carlos will not be old enough to marry for the next eight years without great injury". The same correspondent notes that the leader of the expedition was known more widely as "Don Tristán de Arellano", and that it was only shortly before the expedition that he began to sign himself "Luna y Arellano". His father was Carlos de Arellano y Luna, mariscal de Castilla.

This is a work that should be read carefully by students of Spanish colonization. Seldom in recent years has a work of primary sources so important as this been given to the public. Professor Priestley's admirable treatment of his subject enhances a reputation already gained by his other works. He should now write a volume covering succinctly and in more popular form the story of the expedition.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

Investigaciones acerca de la Historia económica del Virreinato del Plata. By RICARDO LEVENE. 2vols. [Biblioteca humanidades, editadas por la facultad de humanidades y ciencias de la educación de la universidad de La Plata.] (La Plata, Argentina, 1927-1928. Pp. xvi, 324; x, 324.)

These volumes really constitute an economic history of the Spanish régime in southern South America. The author is the scholarly professor of Argentine history in the University of La Plata, who among other works has published an introduction to the law of the Spanish Indies, a definitive study of Mariano Moreno and the May Revolution in Buenos Aires, and an interpretative history of the Argentine Nation. Dr. Levene's interest in South-American economic history was shown in 1914 when he published *La política económica de España en América y la revolución de 1810*. The first volume of the present work deals with three centuries of colonial history extending from the age of discovery to the eighteenth century. The second volume is virtually devoted to studies in the economic history of the viceroyalty of La Plata.

After some preliminary observations concerning an economic interpretation of Argentine history, the author considers in detail the economic and political condition of Spain at the beginning of the modern age. Next he discusses Spanish colonization in its relations to the economic system of the American aborigines. A chapter is devoted to the economic policy pursued by Spain during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Special attention is given to the coins which circulated during that epoch in both Spain and the Indies. The economic origins of the cities founded in modern Argentina and Paraguay are carefully traced. A sketch of economic thought in eighteenth century Spain is presented which pays special attention to the Indies. The policies of Spain and of England toward Spanish America in the eighteenth century are carefully surveyed.

More original is the treatment accorded to the viceregal period of Argentine history. The eleven chapters of the second volume are a series of monographs upon important phases of colonial Argentine economic history after 1776. As an antecedent, careful attention is accorded to the commercial and economic struggle that took place between the merchants of Lima and the people of Buenos Aires. Stress is laid upon the economic significance of the creation of the viceroyalty

of La Plata. A chapter is set apart for a study of the economic and other policies of Pedro de Cevallos, who in 1776 was appointed viceroy of La Plata and dispatched with a large expedition to Buenos Aires. More than one hundred pages are occupied by a detailed and suggestive picture of the economic condition of the new viceroyalty. The monetary system, the fiscal régime, and the mercantile institutions of the colony are presented in high relief. Lastly, a suggestive chapter is devoted to "the birth of a new conscience" in the economic body of the extensive viceroyalty of La Plata.

Though this treatise has no formal bibliography, yet it is fully equipped with footnotes, illustrated by contemporary cuts, facsimiles, and prints, and followed by an index of the names mentioned in the text. Though the author has even carried his researches into the vast inedited materials in the *Archivo General de la Nación*, yet he appropriately disclaims having made an exhaustive study of his huge theme. All in all these volumes constitute a substantial contribution to the cultural history of South America. They outline the main features of early Argentine economic history, furnish a suggestive interpretation of its development, and beckon future investigators into inviting vistas. Indeed, the reviewer hopes that Dr. Levene will himself some day carry his researches into the national period of Argentine economic history.

WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON.

University of Illinois.

European Treaties bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies. Volume II. 1650-1697. Edited by FRANCES GARDINER DAVENPORT. (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1929. Pp. vi, 386.)

Dr. Davenport, a true scholar in every sense of the word, did not live to see the publication of her second volume. In the larger aspects, she had finished the work on her treaties which, it is expected, will be completed with the publication of a third volume. The finishing touches on this third volume are now being given by Dr. C. O. Paullin, who is eminently fitted to carry the work to its conclusion both because of his training and his impartial attitude. Those who have examined and used Dr. Davenport's first volume need not be told of her care in preparing the succeeding volumes, for this is apparent on

every page. No detail was too small for her to probe to its depths if it conduced to the sum total of desirable information concerning any one of the treaties she had selected for her volumes. This meant an immense amount of labor that only those can realize who have been engaged in the arduous task of research of this or similar nature. Her research led her into the intricacies of many languages, into travel in various countries, into the reading of manuscripts dating from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century, and into the careful reading of every scrap of evidence touching the treaties that could be found. She was compelled to make a super-study of diplomatics and of many other branches of historical knowledge as well. It is safe to say that no one living approached her in her knowledge of the treaties she had selected and the incidents surrounding them. Hers was a work that necessitated the utmost concentration, application, breadth of vision, and ability to see. In Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, under whose general guidance she worked, who, indeed, originated the idea for this work, who, moreover selected her to execute it, and whose sense of basic historical values is unsurpassed, Dr. Davenport found the best support for her task. Her work on these volumes is her best monument.

The present volume, which in its carefully worded and organized prefaces, its bibliographical data for each treaty, and its notes, recalls the first volume, includes treaties Nos. 41-84, beginning with the Articles of agreement between the delegates of the commissioners of the United Colonies of New England and the Delegates of the director-general of New Netherland, concluded at Hartford, September 19, 1650 (O.S.) and ending with the Treaty of Ryswyk, Sept. 10/20, 1697. Eleven of the treaties touch Portugal, Spain, and Hispanic America. These are Nos. 45, 50, 55, 59, 60, 61, 65, 68, 74, 77, and 84; and others touch one or the other of these regions incidentally. The treaties of which the numbers are given above, are respectively:

Treaty of peace and alliance between Portugal and Great Britain, concluded at Westminster, July 10/20, 1654.

Treaty of peace and alliance between Portugal and Great Britain and of marriage of Charles II. with the Infanta of Portugal, concluded at London, June 23, 1661 (O. S.); secret article.

Treaty of peace, alliance, and commerce between Spain and Great Britain, concluded at Madrid, May 23, 1667 (N. S.).

First treaty of partition of the Spanish dominions between France and the Emperor, concluded at Vienna, January 20, 1668 (N. S.).

Treaty of peace between Portugal and Spain, concluded at Lisbon, February 13, 1668 (N. S.), by the mediation of Great Britain.

Treaty of guaranty of all the states of the King of Spain, concluded between Great Britain, Sweden, and the United Netherlands at the Hague, May 7, 1669 (N. S.).

Treaty between Great Britain and Spain, concluded at Madrid, July 8/18, 1670.

Treaty between the United Netherlands and Spain, concluded at the Hague, August 30, 1673.

Treaty of defensive alliance between Great Britain and Spain, concluded at Windsor, June 10/20, 1680.

Truce for twenty years between France and Spain, concluded at Ratisbon, August 15, 1684 (N. S.).

Treaty of peace between Great Britain and France, concluded at Ryswyk, September 10/20, 1697. (On September 20, France signed a treaty with Spain.)

Perhaps the most important of these treaties were those of 1670, 1673, 1680, 1684, and 1697. The index should be consulted for materials relating to Hispanic America.

On all points the volume has been worth waiting for. No student of early American history, when studied in its diplomatic relations, can get far without having recourse to this volume and its predecessor. Dr. Jameson's sympathetic introduction to the treaties should be read.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

Mexico and its Heritage. By ERNEST GRUENING. (New York and London: The Century Co., 1928. Illus. Map. Pp. xiii, 728.)

Ernest Gruening spent over five years in Mexico since 1922 making a study of conditions incident to the Mexican Revolution with a view to finding answers to the questions "Why are there revolutions in Mexico?" "Will they continue?" "Are Mexico's troubles of political, economic, or racial origin?" "What underlies the recurrent religious conflict?" "What causes the unnecessary friction between the governments of Mexico and the United States, which has brought the countries repeatedly to the verge of war and may again?" "Why is Mexico a so-called 'backward' nation?"

In the course of his investigations and during the intervals between visits to Mexico the author did much reading in the "published material" on Mexico and has attempted to summarize and interpret its history. As an historian, it must at the start be admitted frankly that the author is not as successful as he is as an investigator of

current conditions. On this account his book is of unequal value in its several parts. It is evident that he has not understood the difference between the treatment inflicted on the Indians by the early conquistadores and that accorded them by the settled colonial régime after about 1550. He seems to have acquired and transmitted the usual belief in Spanish cruelty so common in our school books and evidently to have let this preconception guide him in his choice of excerpts from the secondary works on which he bases his inferences. Therefore he has arrived at the conclusion that one of the most influential heritages of the Mexican people was the cruelty with which their Indian ancestors were treated. Also he imbues this people with all the commonly believed defects in the Spanish character, forgetting that all Spaniards were not like the ruthless adventurers and freebooters who first landed on the shores of the New World.

In concluding that the heritage of Mexico comes from its Spanish and Indian lineage the author finds faults in both these ancestries which seem hopeless of eradication. Apparently they lie as a curse upon the present people of Mexico. Although one may not say with truth that "the mestizo inherits the vices of both races" yet his inherited traits must be blended in him imperfectly and without coördination. "The four thousand year ethnic disparity certainly might furnish a clue to much in the Mexican nature which thus far has eluded the Mexicans themselves." The cruelty, avarice, and bigotry of the Spaniard has been superimposed on the lack of spirit, gullibility, and treachery of the Indian. Hence the Mexican of today. A wellknown historian of Caracas once remarked to the reviewer:

Of course we are aware of the fact that we Venezuelans possess the faults of the Spaniards, but also we remember that we have inherited the virtues of the Indian.

It might be well also to apply such a sympathetic attitude toward the Mexican, and to forget our Anglo-Saxon lack of appreciation of Indo-Latin culture.

The historical part of the book is evidently based on the reading of standard authorities such as Bancroft, Priestley, Chapman, Alaman, and Bulnes, who are frequently referred to in footnotes, but the author seems to have read them to procure testimony to bolster up his own preconceptions. He can find plenty of evidence of cruelty to the Indians, but he, like many others, fails to discriminate between

their treatment by the rough and licentious adventurers and conquistadores during the first fifty years of conquest and their steady assimilation and Christianization during the succeeding two centuries of colonial administration. The *criollos* and *mestizos* who fought for independence and ruled the country after independence, were the heirs of these comparatively peaceful centuries, rather than of the first fifty years of slaughter and of the *encomienda* system. Las Casas, of course, is quoted, but Las Casas should no longer be held as an authority for conditions existing after his death, or even for conditions which he knew at first hand, but for which he has now been shown to have been a narrow minded and prejudiced witness.

As a critical historian, Gruening is not entirely unbiased or successful. His summary of the history of Mexico from the Conquest to the Revolution of 1911 is unsatisfactory. In the Prologue is found the following:

In the North they [the British Colonists] found a virtually empty country whose sparse nomads they exterminated. In the South they [the Spanish Colonists], encountered an established agricultural people, numerically far superior, whom they subjugated.

Basing his conclusion on this generalization, the author makes the statement that the divergence in the two civilizations (Mexico and the United States being two marked and adjacent representatives of these civilizations) lies in the fact that "Anglo-America was settled, Hispano-America was conquered". With this double generalization the reviewer finds it hard to agree, for he has always understood that the extermination of the Indians in North America constituted conquest and that the assimilation and civilization of the Indians in Middle and South America might be considered as settlement.

In those portions of the book—and they comprise more than half of it—in which the author bases his deductions on his own observations, there is assembled much new and valuable information far overshadowing the defects of the historical parts. The book might well have been limited to these chapters dealing with conditions during and since the revolution begun in 1911. The earlier historical sections are little better than misinterpreted summaries of standard historical works. Had the first eighty-eight pages been omitted, the book would have suffered nothing. From pages 91 to 664—by far the larger part of the book—are found several essentially original and valuable sec-

tions or chapters dealing with the Revolution, the Land, the Church, the Army, Labor, Politics, Justice, Education, Health, Foreign Relations, and Cultural Products of the Revolution. In these chapters is assembled a wealth of data on recent conditions in Mexico which the reviewer believes can be found with difficulty, if at all, elsewhere.

Mr. Gruening evidently traveled much and far in Mexico, kept his eyes open, and talked with all kinds and classes of people. He has also hunted up important manuscripts and records to corroborate the results of his investigations. The quotation of these documents in footnotes shows careful and exact work but the repeated references to the standard secondary histories such as Chapman's *History of Spain*, Bancroft's *History of Mexico* and Prescott's *History of the Conquest of Mexico* in the earlier historical part fails to convey even a false impression of scholarship. In fact to one who has studied anything of the history of Mexico it seems absurd and rather irritating. In his preface the writer says:

Footnoting may become an affectation and is after all, largely a matter of self-imposed discipline for the writer. Its chief justification is the aid it gives to the student and the specially interested reader.

Perhaps then it is well that the attention of those who know nothing of the history of Mexico should be called to the standard works on the subject where they may learn the truth; yet the reviewer cannot help but feel that as used in the historical parts of this book, the footnotes are little more than an affectation.

As an investigator and reporter, Gruening shows to much better advantage than he does as an historian. His chapter on the Revolution (partly history and partly current events) containing detailed accounts of the régimes of Madero, Huerta, Carranza, Obregon, and Calles, is vivid, sympathetic and intensely interesting. Emiliano Zapata, by the way, is depicted not as a selfish brigand, as is usually done, but as a sincere man of ideas and a real patriot who endeavored to find a settlement of the land problem in favor of the poor and landless.

Turning then to these chapters based on the author's original investigations, the reviewer is delighted to praise the immense amount of information on the land, the army, the church, labor, and state and international politics which has been gathered and displayed so convincingly. Probably the best thing in the book is the discussion of

how the difficult land problem has influenced the whole of Mexican history and what attempts have been made to solve it. Concluding this chapter the author says:

The agrarian reform has implications far beyond the economic, supremely important as they are. . . . Out of this will, in time, emerge a democracy, not precisely like the varyingly imperfect democracies of the world, but one increasingly shaped by and adapted to the needs of the Mexican people. . . . The failures of its self-government are attributable to many causes, but they rest basically on the economic inequality at which land reform has struck the mightiest blow.

In the chapter on the Army, the author, in tracing the history of revolutions, revolts and *cuartelazos* in Mexico, discovers (although he does not sufficiently emphasize the fact) that most of the disturbances in Mexican history have been due to the selfish ambitions and treasons of army officers who were not soldiers so much as they were politicians and grafters. While the author does not give this as the solution of many of Mexico's difficulties, he might well have brought out more clearly the possibility that were generals and colonels in the Mexican army given their promotion by seniority and not by political preference there would be much less inducement for the higher army officers to revolt against the constitutional government and to "declare" for some particular candidate for president. Also prospects for settled peace in Mexico might be brighter were the army made subordinate to civil authority and were army officers made ineligible to hold civil office. The regular army of the United States has never been a menace to its civil security. In this respect, Mexico might change its methods and pattern after its northern neighbor.

The six chapters devoted to the Church trace its development and influence from the colonial period to the Catholic rebellion of 1926-27. Although not prejudiced against the Catholic Church, the author is evidently not at all sympathetic toward it and finds much evidence to quote showing instances of lack of piety and increasing worldliness of the clergy; of blind support of the Spanish monarchy by the bishops and of their hostility to independence; of the inordinate power of the clergy and of "church splendor *vs* mass poverty"; of opposition to papal authority and of clerical encouragement of French intervention; of the opposition of the church to land reform and lay education; of the fostering of ignorance and superstition among the Indians; and of the belief that the Mexican faith is a "dead faith".

Regarding Labor the author describes the great power which it wields, frequently unfairly and often harmfully to the laborers themselves. He shows the helplessness of employees against the decisions of the arbitration board, which ostensibly is a government institution, but which really is controlled by the C.R.O.M.—that powerful politico-labor organization. In summing up this important subject the author says:

Yet with all its errors, shortcomings, failures and internal weaknesses, the labor movement is the most vital, the most dynamic and the most hopeful force in Mexico today. Its possibilities for good are incalculable. Given its antecedents it has, despite occasional extravagances, proved in a country where all else was chaotic, singularly self-controlled. In an ethnic evolution whose tempo has been slow the rapidity of the C. R. O. M.'s growth—with all allowance for forced inclusions—has been phenomenal. . . . But given the right leadership, conscientious, disinterested, and intelligent, the Mexican labor movement can in the next decade shape the destiny of Mexico and shape it for a more promising future than that unhappy land has envisaged in five centuries.

The chapter on Foreign Relations in which the baneful influence of the United States on Mexico since 1911 is convincingly set forth, should be pondered carefully and taken to heart by our politicians and statesmen and by all those who wish for improvement in our relations with Hispanic America. The exposition based on strong documentary evidence that the United States Ambassador, Henry Lane Wilson, was largely instrumental in the overthrow of Madero and the elevation of Huerta, is a distinct contribution to history. The facts which are brought forth regarding the Mexican policy of the Harding-Coolidge-Kellogg administration constitute a convincing and palpable warning against any further policy of interference by the United States in the internal affairs of the Hispanic American nations.

Although the author has not given clear answers to all the questions which he set for himself to answer and which are noted in the first paragraph of this review, he has undoubtedly accomplished the following objectives enumerated in the preface:

(1) indicated for the first time the agrarian basis of Mexican history; (2) shown more fully than has been done before the background of the so-called religious conflict which has come to the surface repeatedly in recent years; (3) has made clear the economic basis and method of Mexican militarism and Mexican politics; (4) has given the first documented account of Mexican (and perhaps Latin-American) contemporary politics and (5) has made clear the issues underlying the recurring differences between the United States and Mexico.

Another accomplishment claimed for himself by the author, viz: (6) "has brought into relief the unity of Mexico's past and present" is, in the opinion of the reviewer, somewhat doubtful.

The book is handsomely printed and well illustrated with numerous reproductions of photographs. The map of Mexico, however, is scarcely worthy of publication. It is the ordinary map of the commercial atlas type on such a small scale as to be difficult to use. The reviewer fails to find any new information upon it and misses the railroads usually shown on commercial maps. The bibliography is extensive and the index adequate.

According to a red advertising band placed around the outer paper cover, Mary Austen is quoted as saying "No other book on the subject has the scope and finality of *Mexico and its Heritage*". It must therefore be assumed that Miss Austen has read everything that has ever been written on Mexico, but as the reviewer cannot boast of that accomplishment, he must refrain from venturing to state whether he agrees or disagrees with her. He can, however, say that this is an extremely valuable book both for its interest and for the timeliness and permanency of the information which it contains. He can also recommend to students of Hispanic American history and to those who wish to understand Mexico a thoughtful and thorough reading of all chapters beginning at page 91.

ALFRED HASBROUCK.

Lake Forest College.

The Mexican Agrarian Revolution. By FRANK TANNENBAUM. (New York: Macmillan, for the Institute of Economics of the Brookings Institution of Washington, D. C., 1929. Pp. xvi, 543. \$2.50.)

If there were a sub-title to Professor Tannenbaum's work, it should be "A Source-book on Mexican Agrarianism", for that is its real character. The book fairly bristles with tables and graphs, most of them products of the author's personal researches in various Mexican states, or taken from government publications. The subject matter of the tables ranges from food prices to classifications of population and land holdings, and although frequently inconclusive, they are valuable to the student of contemporary Mexican life.

Professor Tannenbaum surveys Mexican social history and rural economy down to 1910 rather inadequately in five short chapters.

Two more, covering the Revolution to 1920, are of somewhat better quality, and close with a neat summary of the revolutionary period. A chapter on the Constitution of 1917 as it applies to the land problem shows perhaps more sympathy for, and comprehension of, Mexico than any other section of the work. Then follow five chapters on land grants and agrarian legislation, in which more attention is given to the forms of legislation than to its actual results, but which are useful as showing the trend of thought in Mexico. The last five chapters, on the actual effect of the Revolution on land holding and distribution in Mexico, are, although often uncritical, the most vital in the book. But in them the author tends to accept too readily, at face value, the supposed results of agrarian legislation. He estimates quite conservatively that "the total net effect of land distribution has been to give some 4 per cent of the total area of the Republic to some 5 per cent of the population", (p. 333), but he does not pretend to give exact data on the distributive effect of the voluntary breaking up of the haciendas in various states. A useful appendix of about one hundred pages of documents and tabulated data on population and land holding, and a very poor index, close the work. One feels the lack of a good bibliography.

As a whole, the book is statistical rather than interpretative. The author does not sufficiently allow for the great gap between Mexican legislation and its actual enforcement. He does not lay enough stress on geographical factors, nor on the bewildering confusion in Mexican land titles and limits (which the reviewer had ample opportunity to observe personally in Mexico). The authorities cited are frequently worthless or nearly so, and there are many errors in the reproduction of Spanish names, as well as in printing.

Yet when all these criticisms have been made, the value of the work as a source book remains little impaired. Professor Tannenbaum has done an excellent piece of research in this field, bringing down to date the pioneer work of George McCutcheon McBride in 1923. If the book is less interesting and interpretative than that of McBride, it is at least much more detailed, and presents a greater mass of workable material for the use of students in the future.

RUFUS KAY WYLLYS.

Temple State Teachers College,
Tempe, Arizona.

Amerikanische Interessen und Prinzipienpolitik in Mexico, 1910-1914. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik des Wilsonismus. By HANS G. RÖMER, M.A. [Ueberseegeschichte, herausgegeben von A. Rein, Band 2.] (Hamburg: Verlag Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co., 1928. Pp. 150.)

In a most interesting manner, Mr. Römer, an M.A. of the University of Wisconsin, has given in his book evidences of exhaustive study on the complicated history of American policy in Mexico from 1910 to 1914. The volume is written rather for American than for European readers, as the author has based the treatment of his subject on studies in American rather than in European historiography. He begins with a chapter on the political and social situation in Mexico during the last years of the presidency of Díaz. Thereafter, he describes why and how President Wilson adopted his Hispanic American policy, namely, in order to cultivate the friendship and gain the confidence of the sister republics in Central and South America. A large portion of the book treats of the struggle for the acknowledgment of Huerta as president—an acknowledgment for which Ambassador Henry Lane Wilson strove unsuccessfully, and which finally caused a rupture between Wilson and his republican ambassador.

President Wilson's policy influenced Mexican history powerfully. He refused to acknowledge Huerta because he had made it a rule not to acknowledge a foreign government unless it were based on law and unless it were in harmony with the wishes of the people. It is interesting also to note how President Wilson was able to get the approval of his Mexican policy in England when he was making advances to Great Britain in regard to the Panama Canal Tolls controversy—a matter that is brought out clearly in this volume. The result was, that after many fresh incidents, including the Benton case, the occupation of Vera Cruz, and the conference at Niagara Falls, Huerta was overthrown.

Mr. Römer has, moreover, explained very clearly the basis of Wilson's ideas. Wilson would make the world safe for democracy, but his policy in Mexico could not be a successful one, because there had been no antecedents for a real popular government. Wilson was greatly at fault in advancing a speculative policy in Mexico instead of following his own theoretical insight.

An extended bibliography concludes this interesting book which meets a need in the history of Wilson's foreign policy.

HANS W. HARTMANN.

Zürich, Switzerland.

Das Problem der europäischen Expansion in der Geschichtsschreibung.

By ADOLF REIN. [Ueberseegeschichte, herausgegeben von Adolf Rein, Bd. 1.] (Hamburg: Verlag Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co., 1928. Pp. 38.)

In the recently published lectures from the International Historical Congress at Oslo in 1928 we find one which may also be of interest to the Hispanic American historian. The author is the well known Professor Adolf Rein of the University of Hamburg.

This small book is exceedingly rich in new ideas. The author limits himself to showing the expansion of the European states overseas and its influence upon European historiography. He brings out the fact that the history of the expansion has been treated from the religious or national point of view and that the latter, for the most part, has been official. The treatment from the non-political point of view is to be found in the so-called cosmographies. From the diplomatic reports has been developed the idea of a general European history of the various states.

Colonies have been treated as internal parts of the history of the mother country. In the eighteenth century especially the historical consciousness of Europeans was an universal one. During the congress of Vienna in 1815, colonies created a rather insignificant interest when compared with the earlier epoch; but since the congress of Berlin, on account of the new world policy, they have assumed an increased importance.

Professor Rein sponsors Ranke's idea of the great historical powers in the writing of the history of the great nations; for there is no longer a world history of European states but a history of the great European expansion—a history of world powers.

HANS W. HARTMANN.

Zürich, Switzerland.

[The managing editor has long desired to insert in this section two reviews dealing with the same book, showing the different angles from which the reviewer approached his task. The opportunity has been offered in the case of Mr. Welles's volumes—one review coming from the reviewer asked to review the work and the other being generously sent in by the other reviewer.—J. A. R.]

Naboth's Vineyard: The Dominican Republic, 1844-1924. By SUMNER WELLES. With a Foreword by the Hon. L. S. ROWE, Director General of the Pan American Union. 2 vols. (New York: Payson & Clarke, Ltd., 1928. Pp. xiv, 496; 497-1058. 2 maps. \$7.50.)

This somewhat formidably long work, with the peculiar main title, concerns itself with the history of the Dominican Republic, from its beginning in 1844 with the close of Haitian domination, to the end of the military intervention of the United States in 1924. The author has had unusual facilities for investigation, and unquestionably he has written the most valuable work on this republic that has yet appeared.

For a number of years, Mr. Welles has been in close touch with Hispanic American affairs. Entering the United States diplomatic service in 1914, he became secretary of embassy at Buenos Aires in 1917, chief of the division of "Latin"-American affairs in the department of state in 1920, and American commissioner to the Dominican Republic in 1922, a post which he held until 1925. This might at once raise the question as to whether these volumes are an official white-wash. The reviewer believes that they are free from any such charge and that they represent a thorough and unbiased investigation. To be sure, the author was probably sub-consciously influenced by the fact of his long experience as a state department official. For example, he does not say as much as the facts would warrant about graft and other evil conditions inherent in Dominican political life. One finds perhaps some further evidence of diplomatic handling in the title of the book, which is explained by a quotation from the Bible, appearing on one of the fly-pages, as follows:

And Naboth said to Ahab, The Lord forbid it me, that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee.

Applying this to Dominican history, it develops that the author wishes it clearly understood that he believes in a policy which meets the wishes of the Dominican people themselves, and not merely what is

believed to be best for them by the government of the United States. This is the sort of thing a diplomat might be expected to say, but there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of Mr. Welles, or the justice of his position either.

After an introductory chapter, in which the history of the country to 1844 is summed up, the author plunges into the account in detail. Nor is the earlier part of the work a mere preliminary to the interventions of the twentieth century. One full volume and part of the second, with nine of the sixteen chapters, concern events prior to 1905, and it is not until page 601 that one reaches the beginnings of the Roosevelt episode. Throughout, one of the main features of the work is in its account of United States relations. Two periods stand out from the rest in this respect. One is the period of negotiations for annexation to the United States, from about 1866 to 1871, and the other the United States interventions, both civil and military, since 1905. Except in his last chapter, or "Conclusion", the author rarely expresses an opinion, but the impression to be derived from his story of the earlier of these two periods, and directly asserted in his "Conclusion", is that an annexation, though eagerly sought by the Dominican government, would have been a misrepresentation of the real desires of the independence-loving people of the republic.

It is twentieth-century relations, however, which will interest most readers. This portion of the work, in some three hundred pages, is probably the best exposition of the subject that has yet been made. The action of the Roosevelt government, growing out of a desire for such an expansion of the Monroe Doctrine as might avoid the necessity of warning European powers not to take effective measures to obtain redress for their just claims or grievances, was nevertheless tactful and helpful, it is made to appear. The Taft-Knox activities do not meet with a like approval. An attempt was made to do away with internal discord, but it was clumsily handled, especially demonstrating a lack of appreciation of Hispanic American psychology. With no more rights than those given in the treaty of 1907 for a United States administration of the custom-house, the Washington authorities went beyond this to advise other policies of reform in the country. The Wilson government appears to have displayed a lofty idealism, but in actual practice to have advanced far beyond even its predecessor, asserting a virtual right under the treaty of 1907 to pass upon the

validity of Dominican elections. This position, taken in 1913, is regarded by Welles as

the first evidence of formal intervention by the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic.

Other suggestions followed, based not only on the treaty of 1907, but also, in the language of the Washington government, on "its tacitly conceded obligations", because of the fact that the United States was "the nearest friend" of the Dominican Republic. And so events moved inevitably to the military intervention of 1916. Welles, at the same time that he asserts the idealism of Wilson, explains the seeming paradox of his actual policy as follows:

There are, however, two reasons for the existence of this paradox. The first, that neither the President nor his advisers had any actual knowledge or understanding of the psychology of the Dominican people, of their requirements, or of the manner in which the influence of the United States might be exerted towards assisting them to govern themselves; the second, that no policy was ever established which determined how far the influence of the United States Government might legitimately be exercised along those lines. There was no attempt made to create a practical policy with a view towards a determined end. As each emergency occurred it was resolved, not as a step in accordance with a preconceived policy, but merely in the light of immediate circumstances. There was no perspective. Consequently, attempts were continually made to encroach upon the sovereign rights of the Dominican people; attempts which President Wilson himself would have been the first to denounce, had he not been forced to consent to them in each instance because of the fact that the situation appeared to have grown so far out of control that the only recourse was further encroachment. Given such premises, complete derogation of the sovereignty of the Dominican Republic was the logical conclusion.

Other chapters tell how the tangle was eventually unraveled, carrying the story to the end of the military intervention in 1924. In this portion of the work, as elsewhere, the author is, if anything, more Dominican in his point of view than American, asserting that

the American Military Government not only failed to consider local customs and prejudices, but was actually ignorant of what they were,

adopting measures that

conformed solely to the customs, habits and prejudices of the intervening power.

He complains, also, that in interventions of this type the United States has not associated other Hispanic American governments with itself.

The reviewer is not in entire accord with the author in his conclusions (not all of which are presented here) concerning United States policies and activities in connection with the Dominican Republic and other Caribbean countries, but repeats, nevertheless, that Mr. Welles's work has great merit. His opinions are reserved for the chapter on "Conclusions", and do not interrupt the story he tells elsewhere. Even when he obviously disapproves, he is temperate in speech. There are neither downright villains nor demi-gods in his account. And the facts are given in great detail. His sources of information appear to have been primarily the government archives of the United States, which were generously thrown open to him, and oral statements of Dominican citizens, though he was also familiar with the confused and inadequate printed literature of the subject. One of the two appendices is a very useful compendium of the treaties that have been entered into between the Dominican Republic and the United States. The book as a whole is well written, with an admirable smoothness and clarity of style.

Since the perfect publicist has yet to appear, it may also be presumed that this work has some faults. Detailed as is the story, the facts might well have been marshaled in a different way by one with another point of view. That question aside, however, these two volumes do show defects that might be expected in a work where the writer is not a trained historian. The bibliography, for example, is a confused jumble of items. In such a long work, an analytical index would be helpful, especially in the case of important names, instead of the bare page-indexing employed. As a work of reference it is none too easy to use. Accents on Spanish words appear at times, and at others remain "in the ink-well". Somewhat more vital is the fact that too little explanation is given of the reasons for the events that are chronicled. Revolution after revolution is described, because some group was dissatisfied, but why it was dissatisfied is rarely made clear. On the other hand, the battles of these revolutions are narrated in considerable detail, rather more than is necessary. And for a history that aims to reflect the ideals of the Dominican people, this gives very little about them. The social and economic phases of the subject are barely touched upon, leaving domestic politics and international relations as almost the sole phase of the work.

Yet, when all adverse criticism is made, the verdict must be ren-

dered in favor of Mr. Welles. In what may be considered a virgin field, without much of anything in the way of good monographs to aid him, he has turned out an excellent work, which will probably be the standard history of the Dominican Republic for years to come.

CHARLES E. CHAPMAN.

University of California at Berkeley.

This is a thorough work written by a man not without important qualifications for his task. It is a history not only of the domestic politics but also of the foreign relations of the Dominican Republic with occasional glances at the policy of the United States toward Hispanic America as a whole, and the author's deep sympathy for the Dominican people is everywhere evident. Its outstanding merit is attested by the indorsement of Dr. Rowe, who has justly remarked that

Mr. Welles has placed every student of Latin American affairs under obligations by his admirable and painstaking study. . . .

Admitting the many excellent qualities of the work—its interesting and able presentation, the author's thorough knowledge of the topics which he treats, and his success in presenting the Dominican viewpoint—it will probably not be inappropriate to point out certain apparent defects and take issue with certain views of the author. The outstanding defect, in the opinion of the present reviewer, is Mr. Welles's failure to give adequate attention to economic matters. Such words as "investments", "loans", and "revenues" do not appear in the index. The word "trade" is mentioned only three times. In speaking of the interests of the United States, the author says little about the properties and enterprises of citizens of the United States in the Dominican Republic and elsewhere, but writes much about disorders in the Caribbean as a threat to the Monroe Doctrine and the Panama Canal, that is, to our national security, which has not in fact been seriously so threatened in decades nor is likely thus to be threatened at all in the near future. Putting aside for the moment any benevolent motive which we may allege, it may be said that disorders in the Dominican Republic and the Caribbean constitute a problem for the United States mainly because foreigners have investments there. A very important motive for our interventions is the

desire to protect these investments, our own as well as those of Europe, the vested interests of the latter region moving us to action because we assume, with very inadequate foundation, it would seem, that the protection by the European governments of their own properties and nationals would constitute a threat to the Monroe Doctrine.

With reference to the benevolent spirit which may have been a factor in our policy, the author has a good deal to say. He appears to condemn much action that has been taken in response to this urge, first, because it has been the benevolence of a sort of conceited imperialism, and, second, because it has not been based upon a thorough knowledge of Hispanic American character and viewpoints and has been characterized by the gratuitous assumption that whatever is good for us must be good for them. In these respects Mr. Welles is probably right. But when he attributes this benevolent imperialism to the "American people", he may be in error. It would be very difficult to show that the majority of the people of the United States have been greatly interested in the "uplift" of the people of the Caribbean. In fact there is perhaps better reason for asserting that the great mass of our people have not given the matter any thought or else have been opposed to intervention of any kind. Not our people, but our politicians and our masters of finance and captains of industry have been the exponents of this aggressive benevolence.

Mr. Welles would remove the fears of the little nations of the Caribbean by pointing out our utter lack of a disposition to acquire more territory. Yet it has not been long since we acquired several hundred square miles in Panama and three islands from Denmark, and it may not be long before we attempt to secure in Nicaragua a much wider Canal Zone than that which we now possess farther toward the south. Moreover, Mr. Welles must recognize—for the Hispanic Americans have long since learned—that there is an *economic* as well as a *territorial* imperialism. There is an imperialism of *dollars* as well as of *dominion*, and the great power of our government may exert itself in the interest of either.

Lastly, in spite of the reviewer's admiration for Mr. Hughes's intellect and personality, he is unable to grasp that statesman's great contribution toward the interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. Mr. Welles would convince the reader that Mr. Hughes has worked miracles in this matter by defining the Monroe Doctrine as a doctrine of

self-defense and then showing every reasonable Hispanic American that the people to the south of us have nothing to fear from that doctrine. In the humble opinion of the present writer, Mr. Hughes has misinterpreted that doctrine and only convinced the Hispanic Americans that he has a large voice and an imposing personality. Historically speaking, the Monroe Doctrine is more than a doctrine of self-defense. It has at times possessed a benevolent aspect, as witnessed by the writings of Clay, Monroe, and Adams—the men who promulgated it—as well as by the utterances of Bryan, Wilson, and others. It has also been used aggressively to increase the economic and maritime power of the United States. In fact, its meaning has depended upon the particular executive who chose to wield it as an instrument of policy. Moreover, even if it were exclusively a policy of self-defense, it would not necessarily follow that it would cease to be disliked or feared by Hispanic America. Self-protection is a very broad term and the pursuit of that policy might easily result in an “infringement . . . upon the independence and sovereignty of other American States”. Would a Monroe Doctrine of self-defense permit Mexico or any nation of the Caribbean to sell or lease territory to any nation or even any large corporation of Europe or Asia? Would it permit Mexico or Colombia to grant a canal concession to the citizens or government of England, or France, or Japan? Would it permit Spain or France to supervise the elections of Mexico, Venezuela, or Nicaragua? Would it fail, even, to object to the arbitration of boundary disputes in Hispanic America by the League of Nations to which many of these states belong? If not, then it may infringe upon the independence and sovereignty of the Hispanic American countries.

In one respect Mr. Hughes did make a contribution to our Hispanic American policy, but it was not at all original. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Wilson preceded him here. All of them sought to cure certain Hispanic American disorders at their source. They attempted to prevail upon the states to abandon the habit of deciding elections by means of revolutions. Self-defense figured here, and protection of the lives and property of American citizens, and perhaps also a sort of benevolence which arose from a love of democracy. But achievement along this line has not been noteworthy. Moreover, if we must interfere in Hispanic America at all, we shall perhaps have to go farther than this. It appears that certain nations of Hispanic America can

effect a change of government only by means of a revolution. If we deprive them of this right or method, then we shall have to help them operate upon the basis customary in more orderly countries. We shall have to assist them in their elections. Otherwise they may be oppressed by tyranny supported by our policy of forbidding revolutions.

J. FRED RIPPY.

Duke University.

History of the Americas. A Syllabus with Maps. By HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON. (Boston, etc.: Ginn and Company, [c1928]. Pp. xxii, 314.)

Ever since the appearance of the Bolton and Marshall *The Colonization of North America*, some such book as this has been awaited from Professor Bolton. The emphasis laid in the earlier volume on the need for greater breadth in the study of the diverse factors entering into the history of North America is here reinforced, but now for the synthetic study of the Americas. For it is undeniably true that the importance of the study of the history of all the Americas—in short of the western hemisphere—has advanced out of the primary stage and is now a real entity unto itself.

The volume is the result of Professor Bolton's own experience in teaching. Some years ago, when inaugurating for his freshman and sophomore classes at the University of California at Berkeley a course in the history of the Americas, he found it convenient to prepare a syllabus for their use—at first in mimeographed and then in printed (but not published) form. Professor Bolton's own words in his preface (p. iv) regarding the work form the best description of it. This terse description is as follows:

This Syllabus presents a general survey of the history of the Western Hemisphere from the discovery to the present time. Emphasis is laid in the first semester on the European inheritance and the planting of colonial societies in the New World, the influence of native civilizations and of geographical environments, colonial policies, commerce, industry, and culture, colonial expansion and international rivalry; and in the second semester, on the wars of independence in English America and in Hispanic America, the development of the independent American nations, their relations with one another and with the rest of the world.

In general form the syllabus is much like other syllabi. The compiler rejects any idea of finality for topics and reading references.

These may be varied at the will of the individual instructor. The complete course as outlined by Professor Bolton consists of 60 lectures. For every lecture after the first, required and reference readings are given, and for each lecture, the main topics to be discussed precede the readings. The volume is divided into two parts, namely, Colonial America and the American Nations, the first containing twenty-nine and the second thirty-one lectures, and each part is divided into several natural divisions. Part I. has an Introduction of two lectures; The Spanish and Portuguese Colonies, of thirteen lectures; The French, Dutch, Swedish, and Danish Colonies, of four lectures; The English Colonies, of seven lectures; and Expansion and International Rivalry, of three lectures. Part II. is divided into The Founding of the United States, in seven lectures; The Founding of British Canada and the Opening of the Far Northwest, in three lectures; The Founding of the Hispanic American Nations, in eight lectures; The Expansion and Consolidation of the United States, in seven lectures; and American Neighbors: Development and Interrelations, in six lectures.

An important feature of the volume is provided by the single-page maps—92 in all—some of which were drawn especially for this work. These will be found very useful and will doubtless suggest other maps which the instructor using this book will find it of service to have.

In addition to the required reading and the references accompanying each lecture, Professor Bolton gives (pp. xix-xxii) a list of books for each month, one of which is assigned to each student for each of the eight months of the scholastic year. This is an excellent idea; and the amount of reading might perhaps even be increased, although the reviewer is aware of the ever-present tendency to overload the student with collateral reading. The serious student, who is interested, will undoubtedly read many instead of only one of these monthly books; nor will he stop at the minimum of the reading of reference books. But alas, all are not ideal students, and it will be like pulling eye teeth to get some of them to read even the one book.

But the use of this book by the conscientious student should result in a wide course of reading on the history of the Americas that will lead to a discriminating understanding of processes working in the several sections of the hemisphere. Moreover it should give him the knowledge that the hemisphere can be studied as a whole. The day is really past when "American history" means the "history of the United States" or of "Argentina", or of any other single section of the

western hemisphere. Professor Bolton has done a great deal to bring this about and this little book is an earnest of what he has been doing in his teaching for the past decade and more. It is suggested that in future editions of this work blank sheets be bound in with each lecture for the notation of other, especially new, works of merit that any instructor may wish to use in his classes. For instance, the very excellent volume just published by Professor Priestley, namely, *The Coming of the White Man*, is indispensable.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

Our Neighbor Nicaragua. By FLOYD CRAMER. (New York: Stokes, 1929. Pp. viii, 243. \$2.00.

Although the introductory chapters of this work are too severe with reference to the Spaniards and the Spanish colonial régime and still another chapter exaggerates the aggressiveness of British policy, it may, in justice, be said that Mr. Cramer has given a good popular account of the political development of Nicaragua and of its relations with the United States. Mr. Cramer clearly is of the opinion that the United States should continue its protectorate over this little country, but he does not appear to have seriously departed from historical accuracy in order to support his view.

From his account two facts seem evident: (1) the canal route has been an important interest of the United States in Nicaragua; and (2) under the impression that the liberals of the country were enthusiastic nationalists none too friendly toward United States influence and interest, the Washington government long supported the conservative party, maintaining it in power in spite of the opposition of the vast majority of the Nicaraguan people. What the author does not explain is the reason for the sudden change of front on the part of the liberals during recent months. They are said now to be quite friendly toward the United States. Are they really so and will this friendship last? What would happen if the liberals should return to their old spirit of resentment at foreign interference and influence and seek to obtain release from the Bryan-Chamorro treaty, whose negotiation appears to have been illegal on many counts? At any rate, speaking from a democratic viewpoint, the party is now in power which would have secured the reins of government nearly twenty years ago had it not been for the intervention of the United States; and had

that intervention not occurred, it may be seriously doubted whether we should now have the canal privilege. Our method of obtaining this concession should be compared with our method of securing our concession in Panama. The parallel is striking, except in the latter case the rights of only one nation were ignored, whereas in the case of the Nicaragua route three nations were involved. Will there be another \$25,000,000 to divide between Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and El Salvador?

J. FRED RIPPY.

Duke University.

Cuba a Pluma y Lápiz. By SAMUEL HAZARD. Translated into Spanish by ADRIÁN DEL VALLE. 3 vols. [vols. VII-IX in *Colección de libros cubanos*]. (Habana: I., pp. XXIV, 256; II., pp. XI, 294; III., pp. X, 272.) 1928.

In this work the editors of the *Colección* have reverted to their usual plan of republishing the text of the author, preceded by an introduction. In this case, however, it was necessary to translate to Spanish from the original in English, and the introduction is a bare three pages.

Hazard's work is too well known in this country to call for extended comment here. First published in 1871, it is of course out of date in many respects as a narrative of description, though it does indeed depict much of Cuban life, at times even in its external details, that is as true today as it was some sixty years ago. It is valuable, too, as a document with respect to the Cuba of the pre-Ten Years' War (1868-1878) era. To Cubans it has an appeal not only because it is a reasonably accurate account of Cuban institutions and customs, but also because of the sympathetic liking of the author for the people of the island. The translation is from the third edition of Hazard's work, published in London in 1873.

Hazard was in no sense a professional writer. Born in 1834, he served on the northern side in the American Civil War. He returned from the war broken in health, and was obliged in consequence to seek a warmer climate. Having been in Havana as a youth, he decided to go there again. To occupy his time, he resolved to make a study of the island and its people. His *Cuba with Pen and Pencil* was the result, a combination of pleasant narrative and pen and ink sketches.

the latter of which are faithfully reproduced in the present Cuban edition. Hazard also made a visit to Haiti, and in 1873 published his *Santo Domingo Past and Present, with a Glance at Haiti*. Three years later, in 1876, he died.

C. E. CHAPMAN.

University of California.

Juan Maria de Salvatierra of the Company of Jesus; Missionary in the Province of New Spain, and Apostolic Conqueror of the Californias. By MIGUEL VENEGAS. Translated into English; edited and annotated by MARGUERITE EYER WILBUR. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1929. Pp. 350. Illus., map. \$6.00.)

This volume is No. 5 of the series "Spain in the West", the publication of which was inaugurated some years ago by the Arthur H. Clark Company. The preceding works of that series were *Athanase de Mézières and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1768-1780* (1914) and *Kino's Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta* (1919), each of two volumes, and each translated and edited by Professor Bolton. Like the second of the above works, the present volume is in large part the record of Spain's attempt at pacification and colonization through the agency of the mission as a frontier institution. As a biographical memoir, it has also the background of the training of Father Salvatierra which fitted him for his mission efforts in Lower California. With the "Kino" mentioned above, and with Bolton's *Palou* and *Crespí*, we now have in English dress and easily accessible the best of the mission narratives relating to the varied kinds of work of the Jesuits and Franciscans in the Californias. The publication of this volume meets a need, for Kino and Salvatierra worked out their plans together and coöperated fully in the realization of mission work looking toward the exploration, pacification, and evangelization of the Pacific coast—although their task was to be continued by the Franciscans after the suppression of the Jesuit Order. The original work is rare, the copy belonging to the Public Library in Los Angeles being utilized by Mrs. Wilbur in making her translation.

The translation is excellently made and preserves the literary qualities of the original author who wrote easily and in an interesting manner. "The translation of the *Vida de Salvatierra*", says the editor in her preface (p. 18), "is made primarily with the idea of providing

a connecting link, of bridging the gap, between Spanish activities in Mexico and Spanish activities in Alta California" and as intimated above, it does accomplish its purpose. In her historical introduction (pp. 21-45), Mrs. Wilbur reviews summarily Spanish exploration in the Californias prior to the work of Salvatierra and the attempts at colonization. This reviewer is of the opinion that a longer historical introduction might profitably have been written, setting forth in greater detail certain aspects of the earlier attempts. Several errors have been noted here. On p. 23, we learn, for instance, that Cortés "in May, 1539, dispatched his old comrade, Francisco de Ulloa with Francisco Lopez de Gomara on a new voyage of exploration". Francisco López de Gómara, of course, was never in the New World, and the reviewer is convinced that this was simply an error of distraction. On p. 36, note 8 is redundant, as the information is given in full in the text. On p. 25, the name of the viceroy of Mexico in 1596 is given as "Gaspar de Zunniga". It would have been far better to have given the Spanish form of his name, "Gaspar de Zúñiga y Acevedo". In the use of accents, no uniform method has been employed, which makes the introduction uneven in that regard. The index is poor, which is not usually the case with Clark books, for it consists only of six pages and no attempt has been made, apparently, to give certain information which one usually expects to find in an index. For instance, "Cabeza de Vaca" is indexed under "Vaca, Cabeza de", instead of under "Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, Álvaro"; and many omissions have been noted. In all respects it gives the appearance of having been made hastily by a novice. The map showing the routes followed by Salvatierra and prepared by Max Mayer, is excellent and will no doubt be consulted frequently in the reading of the work. The main part of the work—the translation of Venegas—is good and forms a welcome addition to the materials available in English for the history of "Spain in the West". It is hoped that the series will be continued. The book, in its mechanical appearance, with its attractive binding, readable type, and good paper, is up to the usual excellent level of Clark books.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

Arte para ligeramete saber la Lengua arauiga. By PEDRO DE ALCALA.
(New York: The Hispanic Society of America, 1928. 38 unnumbered leaves.)

With this reproduction of the extremely rare *Arte* by the Jeronimite friar Pedro de Alcala, the printing of which was completed, as we are told in the colophon, on February 5, 1505, at Granada, the Hispanic Society of America distributes a card which reads as follows:

Some time ago this Society published the Covarrubias *Tesoro de la Lengua Castellana, o Española* in microphotographic form for the convenience of scholars. The text has been thought too small even when a glass is used. The present volume is an experiment with a larger text.

Comparison of the two volumes shows that, whereas the original page of the Covarrubias was reduced to a size of $1 \frac{5}{8} \times 1$ inches, the Alcala has been reduced to only $2 \frac{1}{2} \times 1 \frac{5}{8}$ inches. The result is that the Alcala can be read with the naked eye and very comfortably with the glass. Also the Alcala is easier to handle because it is bound, while the Covarrubias is in unbound sections of 16 pages. Like the earlier reproduction, the Alcala has nine pages of the original on each page of the reproduction—the original consisting of 318 folios in all. It would have led to greater convenience in using the Alcala had the thirty-eight leaves on which the reproduction is printed been numbered, which could have been done without disturbing the lack of foliation of the original.

It would seem that for books of this type, which it is deemed advisable to reproduce, the Hispanic Society has adopted a convenient size. A volume of this size will occupy little space on the shelf and yet is easily legible. Indeed, it is a question whether it might not be advisable to print some modern volumes in this manner—volumes that will find relatively slight use—for book space is daily becoming more valuable. It is suggested that a preface by the Society giving bibliographical and other data relative to the works reproduced in this manner would be a welcome addition to the user.

In reproductions of this nature, it is believed that the Hispanic Society is performing a real service. Future reproductions will be watched with interest.

NOTES AND COMMENT

SPANISH ARCHIVE MATERIALS AND RELATED MATERIALS IN OTHER NATIONAL ARCHIVES COPIED FOR THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS BY THE ROCKEFELLER PROJECT "A" GIFT FUND, 1927-1929

At the beginning of the first year of the Rockefeller Project "A" work in Spain,¹ Professor Samuel Flagg Bemis, European director, was confronted with the delicate problem of securing interpretations of the recent Spanish royal decree regarding the photographic copying of documents in the national archives, which made it difficult to secure integral reproductions of series for the benefit of scholars in the United States. Consequently, the greater part of that year was taken up with negotiations, naturally not rapid in development, in various places and with different officials. But during the spring and summer of 1928, Mr. and Mrs. Lansing Bloom, of New Mexico, employed by Professor Bemis as special assistants, were allowed to select and copy documents in the Estado series at the Archivo General de Simancas on Anglo-Spanish relations, 1480-1678.² Also Dr. Bemis was able to send some typewritten transcripts, "supplementary" to the Henry Adams transcripts already in the Library of Congress, of documents in the Estado series at the Archivo Histórico Nacional and in the Archivo del Ministerio de Estado, Madrid.³ Before the end of the year, prospects though still dark seemed not impossible. Consequently, it was decided that Mr. Roscoe R. Hill should go to Spain as

¹ See T. P. Martin, "Transcripts, Facsimiles, and Manuscripts in the Spanish Language in the Library of Congress, 1929," in *THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, IX. No. 2, May, 1929, 243-246.

² The Bloom film-negative copies in the Library of Congress begin with dates of 1563 (legajo 303/816) and end with 1678 (legajo 998/2555).

³ Bemis transcripts added to the Library of Congress collection since August 30, 1927, cover Spain's correspondence with its diplomatic agents in the United States, 1807-1815, and consist of copies of the following: Archivo Histórico Nacional, Estado, 5633 and 5634; Archivo del Ministerio de Estado, 215-224, and 237.

a special director for work in that country, under that general supervision which Dr. Bemis was giving to the European work as a whole.

Mr. Hill soon found that further work at Simancas was impracticable for a time and devoted his attention to what might be done in the more easily accessible archives at Seville and Madrid. In the Biblioteca Nacional he secured film negative copies of Sotomayor's "Historia de la conquista perdida y restauracion del Reyno y Provincias de la Nueva Mexico" (MSS. 2822 and 2823) and of "Servicios personales del Maestre del Campo Don Juan Dominguez y Mendoza fechos en las provincias de la Nueva Mexico" (MS. 19258): and, in the Archivo Histórico Nacional, similar copies of documents on affairs of the Floridas, Louisiana, Texas, and New Mexico and on the relations of Spain and its possessions with the United States, 1737-1804.⁴ The diplomatic material, it may be noted, is chiefly earlier in date than that covered by the Henry Adams and the Bemis transcripts mentioned above and covers in general the years 1777-1804.

In Archivo General de Indias, Seville, Mr. Hill secured film-negative copies of various items, for which special requests had been made.⁵ but he devoted his attention chiefly to the Papeles de Cuba series, of which he had already prepared, under Dr. J. F. Jameson's direction, a descriptive catalogue for Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington.⁶ In all this work, even with respect to copying, many obstacles had to be overcome. The substitution of the Lemare photographic film-negative process of copying for the old one of making typewritten copies consumed much valuable time; but the improved quality of the work more than justified this expense. By spring the work was beginning to go smoothly; and substantial additions were made to the Library of Congress collection from Papeles de Cuba, so that it now embraces the following: "Co-

⁴ Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid, Estado, 3882, 3884, 3884 bis, 3885, 3885 bis, 3886, 3887, 3889, 3889 bis, and 4220.

⁵ "Servicios de general Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo," 1618 (Patronato 87); "Papeles sobre la conducta y proceder de D. Fernando Palafox y Mendoza," 1642-1650 (*ibid.*, 244); documents relating to New Mexico in the seventeenth century (Audiencia de Guadalajara 138/67-3-32 and 139/67-3-33); Peralta papers, 1654, 1688 (Indiferente general 47); Vizcaino's expedition, 1602 (372/60-4-37); and Expedition to San Francisco Bay, 1774-1775 (514/——).

⁶ See Roscoe R. Hill, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Documents relating to the History of the United States in the Papeles Procedentes de Cuba* (Washington, 1916).

rrrespondencia de los consules . . . los Embajadores . . . los Ministros de los Estados Unidos á los Gobernadores [de la Luisiana y Floridas]", 1768-1816 (104 A and B); "Correspondencia" with the same governors, 1785-1795 (1395, 1425, 1436, 1441, 1442, 1443 A and B); "Florida Occidental. Miscelánea", 1806-1818 (2369); "Luisiana española Miscelánea y Bowles", 1790-1799 (2371); and "Correspondencia de Wilkinson", 1785-1809 (2373-2375).⁷

This beginning, though small in comparison with beginnings made in other countries where no particular obstacles existed and where the photographic film-negative process of copying was already in vogue in the archives, is significant with regard to the future work for American scholars in Spain. It is believed that much of the apprehension which led to the Spanish royal decree of August, 1927, virtually stopping such work has been allayed; and it is hoped that nothing will happen under the careful administration of the Rockefeller Project "A" Gift Fund to revive it. If all goes well, the additions noted above are mere indications of what may be expected during the next three years.

Complementary to the Spanish archive material mentioned above are the series of correspondence and papers relating to American history in other national archives which resulted from intercourse between the various States and Spain, from the beginning of Spanish interest in America until far into the nineteenth century. The work of copying these series along with others more directly related to American history from immigration to diplomacy is only well begun; and any list made now is necessarily incomplete. Hispanic American scholars may wish to note, however, that the Library of Congress has recently received the following: From Austria, the despatches of the ambassador at Madrid, 1770-1823, and miscellany, 1776-1818;⁸ from Prussia, materials relating to the mission of the Chamberlain, Graf von Nostitz, from Paris to Madrid, 1781-1784;⁹ from the Vatican archives, selections from correspondence and papers resulting from intercourse with both Spain and Mexico regarding American affairs,

⁷ See Hill's *Catalogue* for detailed descriptions of the contents of the legajos numbered in parenthesis in the text above.

⁸ Polit. Archiv des K. u K. Ministerium des Aussern, Vienna, Spanien, Dipl. Korres., fasc. 126, 130-135, 137, 140, 142-153, 155-167, 169-172, 175-184; *ibid.*, Varia, fasc. 73-75 (blau).

⁹ Geheimes Staatsarchiv, Berlin-Dahlem, Rep. 96, 69P, Spanien, 1781-1784.

1519-1717;¹⁰ and from Venice, the despatches of the Venetian ambassadors at Madrid, 1566-1568 and 1776-1781,¹¹ the official relazioni, 1682-1754,¹² and the official register of instructions to ambassadors (all countries), 1774-1787.¹³ More comprehensive accounts of the materials received from the several national archives will naturally appear in appropriate publications as the work progresses.

THOMAS P. MARTIN.

Assistant Chief, Manuscript Division,
Library of Congress.

The Business Historical Society, Inc., with headquarters at Soldiers Field, Boston, Massachusetts, is desirous of adding to its collections of business papers—which are of the greatest value for the study of the rise and progress of various business enterprises—some relating to business enterprises in Spain and Spanish America, either as Spanish colonies or independent states. The society is already in possession of the important H. Gordon Selfridge Collection of Medici Manuscripts dating from 1400-1560. These it is now transcribing and translating for publication. The president of the society is Charles H. Taylor of Boston. Charles C. Eaton, of Cambridge, is librarian, and Frank C. Ayres is executive secretary. When investigation again becomes more liberal on the Spanish archives, it may be possible for the society to copy the essential parts of such collections as the papers of the Casa de Contratación in the Archivo de Indias, which would be a very legitimate part of the work of the society.

The Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, the inauguration of which was provided for in the Pan American Conference held at Havana in 1928, held its first meeting in Mexico City in September, 1929. The permanent seat of the Institute will be in the City of Mexico, where quarters are now being built for its housing. At this meeting Dr. William Bowie and Dr. J. T. Medina were elected

¹⁰ The items are so numerous and of such a varied character that they cannot be listed here. They were taken from the Castello series and the miscellanea, in the Archivio Segreto, and from the following minor collections and libraries: Bolognetti, Carpegna, Clementi XI, and Confalonieri. See descriptions, in C. R. Fish, *Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and Other Italian Archives* (1911), *passim*.

¹¹ Archivio di Stato, Venice, Dispacci-Spagna, fil. 6, 179, 180.

¹² *Ibid.*, busta 29.

¹³ *Ibid.*, Deliberazioni, 151-163.

honorary presidents. Ing. Pedro C. Sánchez and Ing. Octavio Bustamante, both of Mexico, were chosen director and sub-director respectively. The personnel of the executive committee is made up as follows: president, Dr. Salvador Massip, of Cuba; vice presidents, Conde de Affonso Celso, of Brazil, and Roberto Andrade, of Ecuador; vocales, Scipión Llona (Peru), Ricardo Fernández Guardia (Costa Rica), vocales suplentes, Dr. Ricardo Rojas (Argentina), Dr. Victor Muñoz Reyes (Bolivia), Dr. José Toribio Medina (Chile), Dr. Américo Lugo (Dominican Republic), Ing. Pedro S. Fonseca (El Salvador), Professor Joaquín Rodas (Guatemala), Dr. Catts Pressoir (Haiti), Professor Ulises Meza Cálix (Honduras), Dr. Carlos Pereyra (Mexico), Alfonso Ayón (Nicaragua), Professor Aristides Rojo (Panama), Dr. Cecilio Báez (Paraguay), Dr. Vicente Dávila (Venezuela), Jesús M. Henao (Colombia), Elzear Guiffra (Uruguay), Rafael Heliodoro Valle (El Salvador), and James Alexander Robertson (United States). Delegates from the United States who attended the meeting were Messrs. William Bowie and Lawrence Martin.

Professor A. Curtis Wilgus has sent a circular letter to persons who might be interested for the purpose of soliciting an opinion concerning the compilation of a series of handbooks of Hispanic American biography. The circular explains tentatively that the project is similar to that of the Dictionary of American Biography "except that each volume will cover a period or topical section and will be complete within itself so far as the lives of individuals living in that period or section are concerned. The sketches themselves will generally be limited to from 300 to 1500 words though in some cases certain contributions will be longer or shorter as the subject may demand".

On March 1, 1929, President Gerardo Machado, of Cuba, issued a decree providing for the erection in Havana of a special building and the providing of full equipment for the housing of the American Institute of International Law—that body having chosen Havana as the permanent center of its activities. The new edifice will house the following organizations: Executive Council of the Institute; Secretariat general of the Institute and its offices; American Academy of International Law; Cuban Society of International Law; American International Library; and Latin American Center of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Mr. Cecil Jane, the author of one of the articles in the present number of the REVIEW is compiling a three volume work illustrating the four voyages of Columbus which will be published by the Hakluyt Society. Volumes I. and II. will contain the materials which were in Major's *Select Letters of Columbus*, and extracts from Bernáldez on the exploration of Cuba (1494). The third volume will include the journal of the first voyage, the evidence of witnesses in the *Pleitos*, and various other documents, including the Syllacio-Coma letter, the Porras narrative, and other pertinent material. The original text of each document will be accompanied by its translation into English as well as by annotations. When possible, use is being made of the text of Cesare de Lollis. Mr. Jane has also a volume just appearing from the Oxford University Press, namely, *Liberty and Despotism in Spanish America*—a study of the problem "How is it that the Spanish American republics have liberal constitutions and are yet constantly in actual fact despotisms?" Mr. Jane attended University College, Oxford, where he read history, and taught at Oxford until the outbreak of the great war. During that conflict he had charge of the Hispanic American section of the War Trade Intelligence Department, which led him to concentrate on Spanish America. After the war, he taught history in the University of Wales for seven years, resigning his post in order to concentrate upon his special studies. In addition to the works above noted, Mr. Jane is writing a life of Columbus for the Oxford University Press. He is the author also of *Metternich to Bismarck* and *The Interpretation of History*.

Mr. Hans W. Hartmann, of Zurich, Switzerland, came to the United States in 1928 as an exchange student, going to the University of Pittsburgh, where, among other subjects, he studied Hispanic American history under Professor N. Andrew N. Cleven. He expects to take his doctorate at the University of Zurich in 1930. He projects the writing of a political history of Central America in the nineteenth century. He expects to make further studies in the United States, Mexico, and Central America.

Mrs. Isabel Sharpe Shepard, of Washington, has translated into English Joaquín Acosta's *Compendio de la Conquista de la Nueva Granada*. In addition, she has annotated the volume and added various appendices. The publication of this book will be looked forward to with interest.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SECTION

THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE INSTITUTO DE INVESTIGACIONES HISTÓRICAS DE LA FACULTAD DE FILOSOFÍA Y LETRAS

On various occasions, there have appeared in this REVIEW notices relative to the work of the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras of the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina. The first extended notice was that by Miss Irene A. Wright which appeared in the issue for February, 1921. In this article, Miss Wright gave an excellent survey of the genesis of the Instituto and its evolution, together with an analysis of the plan under which the Instituto is working. Of the books then published, Miss Wright said:

Editorially, these books meet the requirements of the most exacting criticism. From a good beginning the series has improved in each successive volume, as the work done in various archives has trained those in charge of investigations to recognize and master difficulties, and their experience has taught the editors more nearly to achieve their own advancing ideal with respect to presentation. The latest volume is close indeed upon the history student's conception of perfection in this particular field of work.

Later in the same article she says:

It is not too much to say that among the current publications which deal with American history, none are issued on so carefully premeditated a plan as this one, so especially correlated to deal with all the factors in the life of the past centuries of Hispanic American colonization and development, nor do any so satisfactorily fulfil the highest modern concept of what critical presentation of sources should be. The history section of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters [the old name of the Instituto] of the National University of Buenos Aires honors Argentina in honoring itself with these excellent publications, which are a magnificent exponent of the degree of perfection in research which is being attained in Argentina, the nicety of historical discipline there maintained to the end of dissipating legends and setting forth the far more valuable truths of American history—so long unknown, distorted, or ignored.

From time to time since Miss Wright's article, notices have appeared relative to the books published by the Instituto and con-

siderable use has been made of its excellent *Boletín del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas*, which first made its appearance in July, 1922, under the directorship of Emilio Ravignani and Juan Canter, hijo. The character of the work exhibited by the volumes of the Instituto and by the *Boletín* is such that we can do no less than echo and applaud Miss Wright's judgment—which is our own. Indeed, no more important, basic, historical work is being done on the American continents at the present time than that of the Instituto. In a sense, this organization may be likened to the former Historical Research Department of the Carnegie Institution of Washington which was directed so ably by Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, the dean of North American historians. Like the latter body, the Instituto is placing at the command of students primary sources for American history—the former working mainly in the historical materials relating to the United States, the latter in materials relating to Argentina. For a number of years, in fact, the Instituto has been engaged in making a complete collection of materials in European archives bearing upon the history of Argentina. For this the Instituto deserves the thanks of all students of Hispanic American history. Under its able directorate, to which has been added the well known scholar Diego Luis Molinari, a highly logical and comprehensive plan has been followed from the beginning. In this short resumé of the work of the Instituto, it is proposed to note, almost without comment, some of its publications.

One of the most noteworthy of these is the *Boletín* mentioned above which first appeared in July, 1922, as a small periodical—small in volume, indeed, but enunciating a program that had been thoughtfully considered and which was carefully stated. Since that beginning the *Boletín* has continued to appear at intervals and as this is written, we have seen the thirty-ninth number, that for January-March, 1929, which has a bulk several times larger than the first issue. While the initial policy adopted has been closely adhered to, the scope of the *Boletín* has widened. At the beginning of the second year, for instance, a section of original articles was added and this has been an increasingly important part of the periodical. Yet, the emphasis has been laid on the presentation of primary sources. In the beginning, there were four main sections in the *Boletín*, namely: "Relaciones documentales"; "Inventarios generales o especiales"; "Noticias bibliográficas"; and "Información general". A supple-

ment has been published from the beginning with each issue, namely, "Inventario de documentos publicados" in various official publications—one number publishes a list of important manuscripts as well. New sections added are as above stated, that of "Artículos originales" and a "Galería histórica"—the latter being a portrait of some personage distinguished in Argentinian or Hispanic American history.

In the editorial notice in the first number of the *Boletín* Sr. Emilio Ravignani explains that it is designed to have the "Relaciones documentales" form the substantial elements of the investigations of the members of the Instituto. These consist of notes resulting from research in the archives in which members of the staff happen to be working, and in them there is always borne in mind the solution of some problem or the rectification of previous information. The "Inventarios generales o especiales" consist either in lists of documents or in analyses of documents without any attempt at interpretation. The "Noticias bibliográficas" refer to books, collections of documents, or reviews which publish historical materials. The "Información general" consists of notes of general interest. It is specifically stated that the *Boletín* does not aspire to be a "review", but rather to furnish the raw materials and indications of raw materials out of which materials for reviews might be made. The supplement with its short summary of the various documents listed is a boon to students who can not go to the original *Gacetas* in which the documents were published. This supplement, by the way, is printed on only one side of the sheet a method which the student will find useful for note making. Besides the sheets may be easily removed from the *Boletín* and either filed by sheets or the various items may be cut and pasted on sheets of uniform size and so filed.

Although the editors specifically state that they do not assert that the *Boletín* will "fill a void", there is no question that it has performed that function, for it has met a cordial reception from students in many lands. Sr. Ravignani declares "We have dedicated and we shall dedicate our best desires to the comprehension of historical truth." In an editorial statement in the first issue of the second volume, the same scholar declares "The pages of the *Boletín* are open to all those who are engaged in this kind of work. We demand only one requisite: intellectually honest labor."

The first of the original articles appeared, as above stated, in the first issue of Volume II. in 1923, No. 11-12, and is entitled:

La Expedición libertadora al Perú y los Principios de Derecho público coetáneo”, by Diego Luis Molinari.

Succeeding original articles were as follows:

No. 13-14 (September-October, 1923) and No. 15-16 (November-December, 1923)—“Monteagudo, Pazos Silva y el Censor de 1812”, by Juan Canter, hijo.

No. 17-18 (March-April, 1924)—“Basis para la Toponimia indígena de la Patagonia”, by Roberto Lehmann-Nitsche.

No. 19-20 (May-June, 1924)—“Los Diputados suplentes de Buenos Aires al Congreso general Año 1811”, by Juan Canter, hijo.

No. 21 (July-September, 1924, and No. 28 (April-June, 1926)—“La Constitución de 1819”, by Emilio Ravignani.

No. 22 (October-December, 1924)—“El Estudio del ‘Código Freer’”, by Clemente Ricci.

No. 23 (January-March, 1925)—“El Padre (S. J.) Historiador Rioplatense”, by Carlos Leonhardt, S. J.

No. 24 (April-June, 1925)—“El Origen del Gobierno Real en las Indias Españolas”, by Clarence H. Haring.

No. 25 (July-September, 1925)—“Los Restos atribuidos al Dictador Francia”, by Félix F. Outes.

No. 26 (October-December, 1925)—“Un Pedagogo colonial [José Antonio de San Alberto]”, by Abel Chagnetón.

No. 27 (January-March, 1927)—“Dos Americanismos”, by J. Imbelloni; “Apropósito de la Biblioteca de un Jurisconsulto toledano del Siglo XV”, by Ángel J. Battistessa.

No. 28 (April-June, 1926)—“Pequeñas Cuestiones erúditas”, by Rómulo D. Carbia; “Aclaraciones”, by Clemente Ricci.

No. 29 (July-September, 1926)—“El Método en el Americanismo”, by Clemente Ricci; “Leyendas de América: Las Joyas de la Reina Isabel y el Descubrimiento de América”, by Antonio L. Valverdi; “La Doctrina del Kur o de la Disciplina en los Debates científicos”, by J. Imbelloni; “Apropósito de una Crítica al ‘Compendio de Historia americana y argentina’, del Doctor Carlos Bosque”, by Robert Ricard; “Lorenzo Boturini Benaducci y el Cargo de Cronista de las Indias”, by José Torre Revello; “Manuel de Ayala”, by Antonio Susto.

No. 30 (October-December, 1926)—“Los Trabajos lingüísticas atribuidos a Teófilo F. Schmid y la Labor de Federico Hunziker”, by Félix F. Outes; “La Corrupción administrativa durante la Revolución”, by R. R. Caillet-Bois and E. Popolizio, hijo; “Como y por qué fué escrito el Facundo”, by Narciso Binayán.

No. 31 (January-March, 1927)—“Hans Staden, Arcabucero alemán de la Expedición Sanabria al Río de la Plata (1550-1553)”, by Roberto Lehmann-Nitsche (continued in No. 32); “Desmentiendo un Cuento”, by P. Grenón, S. J.

- No. 32 (April-June, 1927)—“Las Provincias interiores y la Obra constituyente del Congreso nacional de 1824-1827”, by Emilio Ravignani.
- No. 33 (July-September, 1927)—“Hernando de Salazar y Juan de Salazar de Espinosa”, by R. Lehmann-Nitsche; “La Adquisición de Armamentos navales en Chile durante la Guerra del Brasil”, by Benjamín Villegas Basavilbaso.
- No. 34 (October-December, 1927)—“Esbozo de la Historia del Comercio francés en Cádiz y en la América Española en el Siglo XVIII”, by H. Séé; “La Real Audiencia pretorial de Buenos Aires”, by Isaac Manulis; “Noticia histórica sobre el Nombre Luján”, by Julián de la Peña.
- No. 35 (January-March, 1928)—“El P. Martín Dobrizhoffer, S. J., Filólogo e Historiador (1718-1791)”, by Guillermo Ferlongo Cardiff, S. J.; “Estudio sobre el Origen del Nombre ‘Pergamino’”, by Julián de la Peña.
- No. 36 (April-June, 1928)—“El Estudio de la Historia clásica en la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras”, by Clemente Ricci; “El Viaje de La Condamine y los Orígenes del Sistema métrico”, by Adrien Favre.
- No. 37 (July-September, 1928)—“Origen de las Instituciones económicos de la América española, Siglo diez y seis”, by André—E. Sayons; “Francisco Javier Álvarez de Lama y su fracasado Proyecto del nuevo Código hispánico católico fernandino”, by José Torre Revello; “El Lazarillo de Ciegos caminantes de Concolorcorvo, quien fue su Autor”, by Federico F. Monjardins.
- No. 38 (January-March, 1929)—“La Sanidad en la Guerra de la Independencia”, by Isaac Manulis; “En Pos del verdadero Autor de ‘El Lazarillo’”, by Ruben Vargas Ugarte, S. J.; “Peter Corney y el Crucero de ‘La Argentina’, Tra-ducción y Notas”, by Horacio Bossi Cáceres.

Throughout, the high historic tone of these original articles is apparent. In the other sections above mentioned, the student is offered a mine of information. In the section of “Relaciones documentales”, which Sr. Ravignani calls the most important part of the *Boletín*, materials have been offered as follows:

- No. 1—“Un Censo de la Provincia de Buenos Aires de la Época de Rosas, Año 1836”, by Emilio Ravignani; “La Formación del primer Triunvirato”, by Juan Canter, hijo.
- No. 2-3—“Un Proyecto para organizar la Instrucción pública, durante el primer Gobierno de Rosas”, by Emilio Ravignani; “La Vigencia de la Novísima Recopilación”, by Jorge Cabral Texo; “La Asamblea de Abril de 1812”, by Juan Canter, hijo.
- No. 3-4—“‘La Vigencia de la Novísima Recopilación’, Rectificación”, by Ernesto Quesada; Noticia de un tesoro de Archivo; un Album literario”, by P. Grenón; “Los primeros Presupuestos del Siglo XIX, en el Río de la Plata (1803-1811)”, by Juan Canter, hijo.
- No. 5-6—“‘La Vigencia de la Novísima Recopilación’, respuesta al Doctor Ernesto Quesada”, by Jorge Cabral Texo; “Una valiosa Colección de 260 Cartas de Belgrano”, by P. Grenón, S. J.; “Un Códice de la Argentina, de Ruy Díaz de Gúzman”, by José M. Furt.

- No. 7-8—"El Tratado con la Gran Bretaña, de 1825, y la Libertad de Cultos", by Emilio Ravignani; "Un precioso Libro inédito", by P. Grenón, S. J.
- No. 9-10—"Algunos Antecedentes para la Historia de las Investigaciones de Paleontología humana en el Río de la Plata", by Félix F. Outes; "Un Archivo riojano en Córdoba", by P. Grenón, S. J.
- No. 11-12—"Destrucción de un Documento histórico. La Biblia anotada por Ramos Mexía entregada a las Llamas", by Clemente Ricci.
- Nos. 13-14, 15-16, 17-18—"Investigaciones filológicas", by P. Grenón, S. J.
- No. 19-20—"Sustracción de Documentos y un Archivero: Episodio cordobés del Año 1683", by P. Grenón, S. J.
- No. 21—"Diego Estanislao de Zavaleta", by P. Grenón, S. J.
- No. 22—"Nuestro Clasicismo literario", by P. Grenón, S. J.
- No. 23—"Da la primera Revolución de Alto Perú in 1809.—Documentos en Córdoba", by P. Grenón, S. J.
- No. 24—"El 'Reglamento' de 1811 y los Apoderados del Pueblo de Buenos Aires", by Juan Canter.
- No. 25-28—"Un gran Torneo de Historia sobre las Orígenes de la Universidad de Córdoba", by P. Grenón, S. J.
- No. 29—"Cartas de San Martín", by P. Grenón, S. J.; "Escritos hallados en Poder del Espía inglés Roberto Hodgson (1783)", by José Torre Revello; "El Acta de Bautismo del Padre del Libertador, Don José de San Martín", by José Torre Revello; "Dictamen imparcial sobre los Gauchos", by R. R. Caillet-Bois.
- No. 30—"La Prueba del Cedazo", by P. Grenón, S. J.; "Un Pleito sobre Bailes entre el Cabildo y el Obispo de Buenos Aires (1746-1757)", by José Torre Revello.
- No. 31—"La Instalación de la Imprenta Gandarillos", by Juan Canter; "Del Correo del Año 10", by P. Grenón, S. J.
- No. 32—"Documentos referentes a Guillermo P. White", by R. R. Caillet-Bois; "Como escribió sobre las Costumbres de la Colonia un Fraile capuchino", by José Torre Revello.
- No. 33—"Un Emisario del Dictador José Gaspar Rodríguez de Francia, hace Protector de Fidelidad en su Nombre, al Rey de España", by José Torre Revello; "Encomiendas", by Vicente Dávila; "El Acta de Fundación de la Ciudad de Todos los Santos de la Nueva Rioja", by José Torre Revello.
- No. 34—"La Muerte de Luís XVI comentado por un Poeta o colonial", by R. R. Caillet-Bois; "Esclavos blancos en las Indias Occidentales", by José Torre Revello.
- No. 35—"Dos valiosas Documentos referentes a los Límites de San Luís y La Rioja (1591-1600-1790)", by P. Grenón, S. J.; "Noticias de los Vecinos más acandalados de Buenos Aires, en la Época del primer Gobierno de Pedro de Cevallos (1766)", by José Torre Revello.
- No. 36—"Las Invasiones inglesas juzgadas desde Río de Janeiro", by R. R. Caillet-Bois.
- No. 37—"Un Mineralogista afrancesado", by P. Grenón, S. J.; "Una Relación sobre la Intendencia de Salta del Tucumán de D. Filiberto de Mena", by José Torre Revello.

No. 38—"Un supuesto Decreto de Juan Manuel Rosas sobre las Escuelas de la Provincia de Buenos Aires", by Antonio Salvadores; "Aporte para el Conocimiento de la Casa urbana y rústica en la Época colonial", by José Torre Revello.

No. 39—"El Decreto del 26 de Mayo de 1844, sobre las Escuelas de la Provincia de Buenos Aires", by Antonino de Salvadores; "Crónica de la Apertura de la segunda Audiencia de Buenos Aires (1785)", by Eduardo Sánchez Aijona.

The "Inventarios generales y especiales" are found in many of the issues. None are found in Nos. 2 and up to and including 17-18. Materials have been published as follows:

Archivo Histórico Nacional de Madrid—Sección Estado. Relación de las Subsecciones (No. 1).

Archivo General de la Nación, República Argentina (No. 19-20).

Archivo Histórico de Santo Domingo de Buenos Aires; Archivo General de la Nación, Buenos Aires: Índice de Gobierno correspondiente a los Años 1810-1812 (No. 21).

Archivo General de la Nación, República Argentina (Nos. 22-26, 37-39).

Documentos relativos a la Historia de América, en la Colección de Documentos inéditos para la Historia de España (Nos. 26-28).

La Refutación al Manifiesto del Congreso de Tucumán, de 1816 (No. 29).

"Noticia histórica de la Biblioteca universitaria de Sevilla", by José Torre Revello (Nos. 30-31).

Documentos relativos a América, existentes en el Foreign Office (Nos. 32-36).

La Biblioteca del Real Consejo de Indias (No. 36).

Relación de Mapas y Planos relativos al Virreinato de Buenos Aires existentes en el Archivo Histórico Nacional de Madrid (No. 37).

Noticias sobre algunos Documentos en los Archivos del Brazil (No. 39).

In the section "Noticias bibliográficas" are published reviews and analyses of many books and periodicals, and here one may learn of many titles both to books and articles that he would otherwise miss. The section of "Información general" corresponds more or less closely to the usual "Notes and Comment" section that is found in many periodicals.

As hinted above, the *Boletín* has not only increased in size, since its inception, but has shown an improvement in the sureness of presentation of its materials. We can think of one way only in which it might be bettered, namely the use of a better and thicker paper for the temporary cover and the addition to the table of contents on the outside front cover of the page numbers at which the several articles or sections begin. This mechanical device would be of great use to

the student and conserve his time. For the rest, the *Boletín* is a model of sobriety, dignity, and usefulness.

The Instituto (including its predecessor, the Sección de Historia) has also published many volumes and pamphlets of exceptional interest. These fall into distinct series or classes. One continuing series, of which forty-seven numbers have appeared as this is written, is as follows:¹

- I.*—La Administración de Temporalidades en el Río de la Plata. By Luis María Torres. 1917. Pp. 24.
- II.*—Constituciones del Real Colegio de San Carlos. By Emilio Ravignani. 1917. Pp. 18.
- III.*—Valores aproximados de algunas Monedas hispano-americanas (1497-1771). By Juan Alvarez. 1917. Pp. 37, 1.
- IV.*—Los Manuscritos del Diario de Schmidel, breves Apuntes. By Roberto Lehmann-Nitsche. 1918. Pp. 10, 6 plates.
- V.*—Origen y Patria de Cristóbal Colón, crítica de sus Fuentes históricas. By Rómulo D. Carbia. 1918. Pp. 50, 14 illus.
- VI.*—La Personalidad de Manuel Belgrano, Ensayo histórico conmemorativo. By Emilio Ravignani. 1920. Pp. 32.
- VII.*—Relación descriptiva de los Mapas, Planos, etc., del Virreinato de Buenos Aires, existentes en el Archivo general de Indias. By Pedro Torres Lanzas. 3d ed., with additions and a notice by Emilio Ravignani. 1921. Pp. 171, 3, and 77 plates.
- VIII.—Los Archivos de Corrientes. By Eduardo Fernández Olguín. 1921. Pp. 23, 1 and 1 plate.
- IX.—El "Plan" atribuido a Moreno y la "Instrucción" de Chiclana. By Ricardo Levene. 1921. Pp. 28 and 3 plates.
- X.—Escritos inéditos de Antonio Zinny. Preceded by a prologue by Emilio Ravignani and a bio-bibliographical essay by Narciso Binayán. 1921. Pp. LXXXI, 3, 181, 2.
- XI.*—Los Archivos de la Ciudad de Santiago del Estero. By Andrés A. Figueroa. 1921. Pp. 31, 1.
- XII.*—Los Archivos de la Rioja y de Catamarca. By P. Antonio Larrouy. 1921. Pp. 44.
- XIII.*—Memoria de la Sección de Historia (1920-1921). By Emilio Ravignani. 1921. Pp. 23, 1.
- XIV.—Antecedentes de la Revolución de Mayo, I. El protectorado portugués en el Virreinato del Río de la Plata, 1808, Marzo-Mayo. By Diego Luis Molinari. 1922. Pp. 21, LX.
- XV.—Los Archivos de la Asunción del Paraguay. By Juan F. Pérez. 1923. Pp. 42.

¹ Those titles in this series marked with an asterisk, we have not seen.

- XVI.—Henry Harrisse. *Ensayo bio-bibliográfico*. By Narciso Binayán. 1923. Pp. 36.
- XVII.—Los *Historiografos argentinas menores*, su *Clasificación crítica*. By Rómulo D. Carbia. 1923. Pp. 22.
- XVIII.*—La *Epoca de Rosas*, con una *Introducción sobre la Evolución social argentina*, por Ernesto Quesada, un *apéndice que contiene la Bibliografía crítica de un Ensayo sobre el Concepto de la Dictadura de Rosas*, por Narciso Binayán [y un *Epílogo sobre una Visita a Rosas en Southampton*], edición de Jubileo en el XXV Aniversario. 1923. Pp. XCVII, 3, 240.
- XIX.—La *Patria de Cristóbal Colón*, examen crítico de las *Fuentes históricas en que descansan las Aseveraciones itálicas e hispánicas, acerca del Origen y Lugar de Nacimiento del Descubridor de América*. By Rómulo D. Carbia. 1923. Pp. 70 and 14 illus.
- XX.—*Actas de la Comisión creada por el Soberano Congreso de Tucumán*. By Emilio Ravignani. 1924 Pp. 31, 1, LIV, 2.
- XXI.—*Antecedentes de la Revolución de Mayo*. II. *Un Virrey, 1808, Mayo-Julio*. By Diego Luis Molinari. 1923. Pp. 18, CLI, 8.
- XXII.—*Estudio crítico del Código Freer*, realizado en el *Seminario de Historia de la Civilización, de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Cursos 1922-1923*, diridido por el *Profesor Clemente Ricci*. 1924. Pp. V, 1, 94, 4, and 4 plates.
- XXIII.—*Bibliografía de Bernardo Monteagudo*. By Carlos I. Salas. A posthumous work with a notice by Emilio Ravignani. 1924. Pp. 193, 1 and portrait.
- XXIV.—*Medallas europeas relativas a América*. By J. T. Medina. 1924. Pp. XV, 1, 377, 3.
- XXV.—La *Fuente de las Fuentes para la Historia de los Años 68-69 del Imperio romano*, *Estudio realizado en el Seminario de Historia de la Civilización, de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Curso 1923*, dirigido por el *Profesor Clemente Ricci*. 1925. Pp. XIX, 1, 149, 3.
- XXVI-XXVII.—*Diccionario de Anónimos y Seudónimos hispanoamericanos*. Compiled by José Toribio Medina. 2 vols. 1925.
- XXVIII.—*Inventario del Archivo general de Indias*. By José Torre Revello. 1926. Pp. 24.
- XXIX.—*Contribución al Estudio de nuestra Toponimia*. I. *Pilcomayo, Paraguay, Guapay*. By Luis F. Deletang. 1926. Pp. 83, 1.
- XXX.—*Archivo general central de Alcalá de Henares, Reseña histórica y Clasificación de sus Fondos*. By José Torre Revello. 1926. Pp. 34 and 4 plates.
- XXXI.—*Contribución a la Historia y Bibliografía de la Imprenta en Montevideo*. By José Torre Revello. 1926. Pp. 15, 1.
- XXXII.—*Antecedentes de la Revolución de Mayo*. III. *El Levantamiento general y la Política portuguesa, 1808, Agosto Septiembre*. By Diego Luis Molinari. 1926. Pp. 14, VLI, 3, and 4 facsimiles.
- XXXIII.—*Los Archivos de San Luis, Mendoza y San Juan*. By Eduardo Fernández Olguín. 1926. Pp. 62.
- XXXIV.—*Papeles de los antiguos Jesuitas de Buenos Aires y Chile*. By Carlos Leonhardt, S. J. 1926. Pp. 48.

- XXXV.—La Biblia de Ferrara. By Clemente Ricci. 1926. Pp. 41, 1, and 5 plates.
- XXXVI.—Los Archivos españoles. By José Torre Revello. 1927. Pp. 41, 1.
- XXXVII.—Los Archivos de Salta y Jujuy. By Eduardo Fernández Olguín. 1927. Pp. 92 and 1 plate.
- XXXVIII.—Adición a la Relación descriptiva de los Mapas, Planos, etc., del Virreinato de Buenos Aires, existentes en el Archivo general de Indias. By José Torre Revello, with prologue by Martín Noel. 1927. Pp. 128, 5, and 67 plates.
- XXXIX.—Don Juan de San Martín. By José Torre Revello. 1927. Pp. 20, XXXIV, 2.
- XL.—En Torno a un "Papel anónimo" del Siglo XVIII. By Abel Chagnetón. 1928. Pp. 31, LV, 2.
- XLI.—La Expedición de Corso del Comodoro Guillermo Brown en Aguas del Pacífico, Octubre de 1815-Junio de 1816. By J. T. Medina. 1928. Pp. 53, 1, LII, 6.
- XLII.—El Monumentum Ancyranum. Estudio crítico realizado en el Seminario de Historia de la Civilización de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Curso 1925-1926, dirigido por el Profesor Clemente Ricci. 1928. Pp. 83, XXXI.
- XLIII.—Documentos referentes a la Argentina, en la Biblioteca Nacional y en el Deposito hidrográfico, de Madrid. By José Torre Revello. 1929. Pp. 67, 1.
- XLIV.—Ensayo biográfico sobre Juan de Solórzano Pereira. By José Torre Revello. 1929. Pp. 25, 1, LII, II.
- XLV.—Los Cosarios del Río de la Plata. By Theodore S. Currier. 1929. Pp. 65, XVI, 1.
- XLVI.—Noticias históricas sobre la Recopilación de Indias. By José Torre Revello. 1929. Pp. 28, XXVI, 2.
- XLVII.—Documentos referentes a la Historia argentina en la Real Academia de la Historia de Madrid. By José Torre Revello. 1929. Pp. 66, 1.

An important series is that of original documents relating mainly to the history of Argentina. Among these are the following:

- Gobierno del Perú, Obra escrita en el Siglo XVI por el Licenciado Don Juan Matienzo, Oidor de la Real Audiencia de Charcas. With a notice by José Nicolás Matienzo. 1910. Pp. X, 219, 1.
- Documentos relativos a la Organización constitucional de la República Argentina. With notice by José Nicolás Matienzo. 3 vols. 1911-1912. With alphabetical index of the three volumes. 1914. Pp. 44.
- Documentos relativos a las Antecedentes de la Independencia de la República Argentina. With notice by José Nicolás Matienzo. 2 vols. 1912. [The second volume treats of "Asuntos eclesiásticos".]
- Documentos para la Historia del Virreinato del Río de la Plata. With notice by José Nicolás Matienzo and Luis M. Torres. 3 vols. 1912-1913. [Index of 44 pp. 1913.]
- Documentos para la Historia Argentina. A continuing series, Vols. I-IX, XI-XIV,

XVIII-XIX. These treat of the following matters:

- I.—Real Hacienda, 1776-1780.
- II.—Real Hacienda, 1774-1780.
- III.—Colonias orientales del Río Paraguay o de la Plata.
- IV.—Abastos de la Ciudad y Campaña de Buenos Aires, 1773-1809.
- V.—Comercio de Indias. Antecedentes legales, 1713-1778.
- VI.—Comercio de Indias. Comercio libre, 1778-1791.
- VII.—Comercio de Indias. Consulado, Comercio de Negros y de Extranjeros, 1791-1809.
- VIII.—Sesiones de la Junta electoral de Buenos Aires, 1815-1820.
- IX.—Administración edilicia de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, 1776-1805.
- XI.—Territorio y Población. Padrón de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, 1778.
- XII.—Territorio y Población. Padrón de la Campaña de Buenos Aires, 1778; Padrones complementarios de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, 1806, 1807, 1809, and 1810.
- XIII.—Comunicaciones oficiales y confidenciales de Gobierno, 1820-1823.
- XIV.—Correspondencias generales de la Provincia de Buenos Aires relativas a Relaciones exteriores, 1820-1824.
- XVIII.—Cultura. La Enseñanza durante la época colonial, 1771-1810.
- XIX.—Iglesia, Cartas Anuas de la Provincia del Paraguay, Chile y Tucumán, de la Compañía de Jesús, 1609-1614.

Volumes of this series in press are as follows:

- X.—Territorio y Población. Padrones de la Ciudad y Campaña de Buenos Aires, 1726, 1738, and 1744.
- XV.—Relaciones interprovinciales. La Liga Litoral, 1829-1833.
- XVI-XVII.—*Ibid.*
- XX.—Iglesia. Cartas anuas de la Provincia del Paraguay, Chile y Tucumán, de la Compañía de Jesús, 1615, 1616, 1617, 1618-1619, 1626-1627, 1628-1631, 1635-1637.

Various other volumes of this series are now in preparation. The documents are admirably presented and edited.

Two unnumbered pamphlets are as follows:

- Los Archivos de Paraná y Sante Fe.—Informe del Comisionado P. Antonio Larrouy. 1908. Pp. 23, 1.
- Los Archivos de Córdoba y de Tucumán.—Informe del Comisionado Antonio de Larrouy. 1909. Pp. 61, 1.

The series "Biblioteca Argentina de Libros Raros", of which five volumes have appeared is of special value. These are facsimiles of old and rare books that are of importance for the history of America. Those published are as follows:

- I.—Antonio de León, *Tratado de Confirmaciones Reales*, 1630. With an Introduction by Diego Luis Molinari. 1922. Pp. XV, 1, 412, 1.
- II.—*Leyes y Ordenanzas nuevamente hechas para la gobernación de las Indias*, 1542-1543. Edition of 1603, with an introduction by Diego Luis Molinari. 1923. Pp. XIX, 3, 28, 6.
- III.—Bartolomé de las Casas o Casaus, *Colección de Tratados* 1552, 1553. With a notice by Emilio Ravignani. 1924. Pp. XIII, 3, 648, 16.
- IV.—Fr. Joseph Antonio de San Alberto, *Carta a los Indios infieles chiriguano* [1790?]. Preliminary note, biography, and bibliography by J. T. Medina. 1927. Pp. LX, 2, 45, 8, and plate.
- V.—Fr. Domingo de Neyra, *Ordenanzas, Actas primeras de la moderna Provincia de San Agustín de Buenos Aires, Thucuman y Paraguay* [1742?]. With introduction by Jorge M. Furt. 1927. Pp. XXIV, 2, 292, 21, 3, and 1 plate.

Another volume is in press, namely:

[*Libros reales de Gobierno y Gracia de la Secretaría del Perú que por . . . Orden del Señor Licenciado Don Rodrigo de Aguiar y Acuña, ha leydo y passado el Licenciado Antonio de León*] y [*Discurso sobre la Importancia, forma y Disposición de la Recopilación de Leyes de las Indias, que . . . presenta el Licenciado Antonio de León*]. With an introduction by Emilio Ravignani.

Still another series has been started which is known as the “*Colección de Viajeros y Memorias Geográficas*”. The only volume published in this series is

John Pullen, *Memoirs of the maritime Affairs*, etc.; Lewis Pain, a short *View of Spanish America*, etc., and E. E. Vidal, *Picturesque Illustrations of Buenos Aires and Montevideo*, etc. A Spanish version by Carlos Muzio Sáenz Peña. With notice by Emilio Ravignani. 1923. Pp. XVII, 1, 256, 4 facsimilies and 25 plates.

The first volume of a new collection namely, “*Estudios y Documentos para la Historia del Arte colonial*”, is now in preparation. This is announced as:

Acerca de algunos Documentos inéditos del Archivo general de Indias, referentes a la Arquitectura virreinal, by Martín Noel y José Torre Revello.

Thus, as has been seen in this brief resumé, the Instituto has undertaken a large program, and has, moreover, carried much of it into execution. Its continuing series will doubtless provide much scholarly work for many years to come, and from time to time, it is expected, if the past is any criterion of the future, that new series will be undertaken. The work has been planned on a solid founda-

tion, the execution has been thorough and scholarly, and the end sought has always been the presentation of historical truth. The rest of the historical world will do well to keep their eyes on this earnest set of men.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

MANUSCRIPT HISPANIC AMERICANA IN THE AYER COLLECTION OF THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY, CHICAGO

The aggregate amount of documentary and map material touching Hispanic American history now in the United States would doubtless amaze most scholars, but its scattered location has prevented a full knowledge of this wealth. While it is true that at times the material now in this country, either in the form of originals or of transcripts and reproductions (photostat or film) will suffice, unsupplemented, for the investigation of a given study, in the majority of instances this will be found not to be the case. However, it is equally true that the use of the materials in this country, could the student have knowledge of, and access to, them, would frequently increase markedly the value of brief studies and add materially to the value of longer studies (including doctoral dissertations).

In a general way the student of Hispanic American history knows or suspects the value of Hispanic American manuscripts in the Library of Congress,¹ the Department of State, the Oliveira Lima Collection of the Catholic University of America,² the University of Texas (the García Collection, especially), the University of California at Berkeley (the Bancroft Collection, especially), the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, the Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library, the William E. Clements Library, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the New York Public Library, the New York Historical Society, The Hispanic Society of America, Harvard University, Yale University, the John Carter Brown Library, and other institutions. But for most of these collections, there are no lists or calendars availa-

¹ See the *Handbook of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress* (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1918). This is not up to date, especially for the many copies, transcripts, and photostat and film reproductions, that have been and are steadily coming into the library from foreign archives. [See the Note by Thomas P. Martin in this issue.—Ed.]

² Some of these manuscripts were described by Dr. Manoel de Oliveira Lima in *THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW* for May, 1928.

ble, and the student must use much valuable time in finding where material that he should see exists. Also, there are many documents in institutions not mentioned above, and in private hands. In the course of the last few years it has been my good fortune to hear of and to examine considerable bodies of material. With the convenience of other students in mind, I have made the subjoined list of materials in the Ayer Collection, and expect soon to complete another list for the Huntington Library. It is suggested that those having specialized knowledge of other collections make similar lists; also that individual items in private hands or in small libraries be thus reported.³ In due time, we shall have information that is badly needed, and the work of students coming after us will not only be lightened but greatly advanced, for he will often hear of materials in this way which would otherwise escape his attention. The list of documents in the Ayer Collection follows:

THE LIST⁴

Alzate y Ramirez, Josef Antonio: *Memoria sobre la naturaleza, cultivo y beneficio de la grana*. Mexico, 1777. Small fol., 137 ll. Several illustrations.

Casas, Bartolome de las: *Historia de las Indias*. Libro segundo. Sm. fol., 391 pp. Sixteenth century copy.

——— (Complete) Copied in 1830. 6 vol., fol.

Coffryth, D.: *Account of the Cariba Islands*. 1607. 12 mo., 37 ll. Partly in the author's hand; rest contemporary.

The name is difficult to make out. The library calls it "Ellfryth".

Copia paleográfica de los antiguos libros de Cabildo . . . de esta capital . . . 1524-1562. Mexico, 1850-1860. 6 vol., sm. fol.

³ It is suggested that those compiling such lists or notes send them to the editor of this REVIEW.—Ed.

⁴ This list was prepared some time ago for private, personal use and not for publication, which explains the occasional rather unfortunate brevity of entry. However, an endeavor was made to include every item in some manner, except those relating to the present United States, Canada, and at times to those north-west frontiers of Mexico which tend to be considered important only because they became the base for the settlement of California and Arizona. The Ayer Collection includes probably three hundred thousand pages of transcripts from Spain, and documents from the Ramírez Library and elsewhere, for the history of California, Louisiana, and other Spanish parts of the United States, as well as some material upon the Philippines and French America.

Cortez, Hernan: Carta relacion enviada a S. M. el Emperador nuestro Sr. por el capitan general de la Nueva España. Copia, hecha ca. 1700. Sm. fol., 241 ll.

Cuatro indices de documentos existentes en el Archivo de Indias. Sevilla, 1880. Tall 16 mo.

These indices concern the Philippines.

Charles V.: Letter by, Saragossa, January 7, 1534. 3 pp.

Concerns Central America, Yucatan, and Florida.

Espeleta, José de: Relacion del gobierno del Excelentísimo . . . [N.p.] 1796. 123 ll.

Extracto de la primera Junta general de la Real Compañía de Filipinas. Madrid, 1793. Large 8vo., 7 ll.

Printed copies of this are not uncommon.

Galvez, José de: Informe sobre el estado de Mexico, California, Sonora, y provincias remotas de Nueva España. 1768-1778. Sm. fol., 74 ll.

Herrera, Antonio: Description of the Islands and Continents of the Ocean which are called the West Indies. Fol.

——— General history of the deeds of the Castilians in the islands and Continents of the Western Ocean. [First three decades.] 6 vol. Fol.

These do not seem to be the same version as the John Stevens translation.

Ixtlilxochitl, Fernando d'Alva: Sumaria relación de Nueva España. Mexico [n.d.; about 1680] 146 ll.

——— The same. 122 ll.

——— The same. 1755. Fol. 566 ll.

Labat, Jean Baptiste: Singularitez des Isles d'Amerique, tirés des voyages du R.P. J.B.L. Besançon, 1768. 12 mo., about 155 pp. Illustrations.

Extracts only upon the natural history.

Lambestye, M. de: Histoire des Caraibes. [About 1760.]

Letters relating to the Spanish conquest in America. 2 vol.

Nineteenth century copies, by or for, Sir Arthur Helps.

Libro de la descripcion . . . del Paraguay y Rio de la Plata. 18th century.

Lopez, Gregoire: Chronica de Nueva España en los años 1552-1553. Mexico, ca., 1580. Fol., 372 pp.

L[utheureau], J[ean-Guillaume] A[ntoine] ; and Charles de V[illery] :
 Histoire des Republiques Centro-Americaines, où Greytown devant
 l'Europe. Paris, chez les Principaux Libraries, 1858. Fol., 198 ll.
 A very poorly written manuscript, much corrected, as though a rough draft
 prepared for publication.

Memoire de l'establissement des Isles François du Vent de l'Amerique.
 Fol., 176 pp. Signed at end, October 26, 1728.

Appears to have no value, unless possibly for contemporary occurrences and
 conditions.

Memoires de l'Amerique. 3 vol., sm. fol. Also one vol. of maps.

Vol. 1. Memoires de l'Amerique et Opinion de l'Origine de ses Inhabitants.
 761 pp.

Mainly on origin of Indians and French in North America.

Vol. 2. Memoires de la Louisiane, St. Domingue, Caiene, Martinique, Guinee,
 Bourbon de France, et Pondicherry. 853 pp.

Vol. 3. Memoires de la Marine, Commerce et Colonies. Ca. 180 pp.

Copies of important letters, diplomatic instructions, and descriptions, much
 relating to America, and apparently drawn up for the use of the
 French commissioners in negotiating the treaty of Ryswick.

Memorias concernientes a la expedición á México de D. Juan de Vi-
 llaba. 1764-1769.

Mendoza, Antonio : Mining laws. Mexico, January 14, 1550. Fol., 16
 pp., contemporary copy. Signed and rubricated, probably by a
 clerk, with Mendoza's signature pasted on.

Mota Padilla, Matías de la : Conquista del Reino de Nueva Galicia.
 [n.p.] 1742. Folio, xxvi and 781 pp.

Oviedo y Valdes, G. F. : Libro XX. de la segunda parte de la historia
 general de las Indias. 1557.

Revillagigedo, Conde de : Instruccion de gobierno que el Virrey de
 Nueva España el Conde de R. . . . dexó á su sucesor el Marqués
 de Branciforte en 30 de Junio de 1792. Mexico, 1792. Large 8vo.,
 306 ll.

Solórzano Pereira, Juan de : Libro primero . . . [N.p.] 1622. Fol.,
 480 pp.

Southuel, Tomás : Copia del manifiesto . . . proponiendo el estableci-
 miento de pescas . . . en 1769. A Pardo, 8 de Febrero de 1783.

Concerns Honduras. Accompanied by a manuscript map.

Tabat, T. : Carta al . . . Havana, 16 de marzo de 1622.

Ulloa, León : Relación historial y geográfica . . . Havana, 1830.

Velez de la Madriz, Juan Joseph : Apuntes que ofrece a L. R. P. del
 Rey Carlos III el Sabio . . . Cadiz, 1762. 8vo. 77 pp.

Votos de los once comprendidos en el proceso formado con motivo de la rendición de la plaza de Habana . . . en 1762. Madrid, 1765.

Yglesias de Indias. Folio, 1631-1649. About 500 pp.

This is a binder's title for a collection of some thirty documents bought from the Ramírez library, though they are apparently not mentioned in the catalogue of that collection. Many were probably gathered for the use of Gil González Davila in writing his *Teatro Eclesiástico*, and the whole group may well have the same provenance. These materials are as follows:

Letters and reports on religious foundations in Mechoacan, 1645-49.

Acts of the two synods of Honduras, 1630-31.

Visita of the Archbishop to Toluca, etc., 1646.

Papers concerning the Araucanian war, 1633-1638.

Clerics killed by the Indians while on way to preach in the Far East, 1600.

Catedráticos naturales de la ciudad de los Reyes que han sido de la Real Universidad della.

Titulos de armas dadas para Phelipe II á villas y conquistadores del Perú.

Relación de las provincias y conventos que la Orden de la Merced tiene en las Indias Occidentales. Religiosos de la Orden martirizados . . . y catálogo histórico de los Arzobispos y Obispos de la Orden en las Indias. . . .

Renta del obispado de Nueva Galicia y Vizcaya, 1608.

Ordenanzas de D. Pedro de Melian para la buena gobernación de los Indios de Chimaltenango, 1639.

Rentas del obispado de Arequipa, 1640-1646.

Encomienda del Conde de Montezuma. Mexico, 1646.

Declaración de los Religiosos de San Francisco, de que pertenece á ellos solos la conquista espiritual de California. 1649.

Carta original del Capitan General de la Armada D. Juan Pujadas de Gamboa, al Rey, 6 de Septiembre de 1649, dando cuenta de asuntos particulares relativos a su mando, y de Vera Cruz y Habana.

Noticias particulares de Puerto Rico, y de los anexos de su Obispado. . . . Extraídos por el licenciado Diego de Torres y Vargas, 1647, a Gil González Dávila.

Representación a S. M. por el Obispo de Cuba Almandariz, y descripción de su obispado, fecha 1620, y firmado a su mano.

Instrucción exacta y razón del beneficio que se ha de hacer a la planta de los Nopales, de la grana Cochinilla, y como se ha de matar y beneficiar etc. [Document of the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century, to judge from writing.]

Colored illustration.

Cuenta y razón de las que a tomar en el Tribunal de Cuentas de México, 1641.

Primicias del Peru en cantidad, letras, armas, gobierno y nobleza; catálogo de personas de ambos sexos, escrito por Fray Baltasar de Bustamante del Orden de San Francisco, dirigido á Felipe IV. 1640.

MAPS

As the maps of the Ayer Collection have been described in a mimeographed booklet by Miss Clara A. Smith (published at Chicago, 1927), it seems useless to list them fully. They include among others the following notable early portulans and charts.

1509. Harigonio, Fra Bona: *Figura totius orbe thexora universale de Fra b. h. in venetia ano navitate domine mceceix delino.*

On vellum. 340 x 320 mm. Oval projection.

1516. Brunacius, Baldo: A. D. MDXVI. *Mapa mundi.* Baldo Brunaciu. Pizano, M. F.

On vellum. Portulan chart. 328 x 225 mm.

1525. Barbolano, Hieronymo: *Universale charta de navigatione de fra h. b. in venetia mdxxv.*

Portulan chart on vellum. 333 x 230 mm.

1541. Bonaldo, Dolfin: *Universale tabula del mondo per la necessita de navigatione a la india nova facta da mi d. b. in venexia MdXLI.*

Portulan chart on vellum. 334 x 232 mm.

[mid 16th cent.] [Agnese, Baptista:] Small manuscript atlas on vellum, with 15 maps, of which 6 show America. Made at Venice.

Unlike many of this designer's products, this shows evidence of much use.

[ca. 1600] Portuguese portulan atlas on vellum, 455 x 320 mm. Twelve leaves: of title, calendar and tables, twelve leaves with twenty-four charts.

ROLAND D. HUSSEY.

University of California,
at Los Angeles.

NOTES

An Executive Decree of July 23, 1929, authorizes the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Venezuela to cause a selection to be made of the best letters, speeches, proclamations, etc. of Simón Bolívar, copied from the original texts, for the International Institute of Intellectual Coöperation. The latter organization will have them translated into English and French and will publish them as part of its program of editing the most characteristic works of each Hispanic American nation.

The Quivira Society, organized in 1929 by a group of investigators engaged in research pertaining to the early history of the southwestern part of the United States and of northern Mexico, proposes to publish a series of volumes embodying chiefly English translations of original Spanish documents relating to that vast and interesting field, although rare original English accounts will not be ignored.

The Society is sponsored by Arthur S. Aiton, University of Michigan; Lansing B. Bloom, editor of the *New Mexico Historical Review*; Herbert E. Bolton, Director of the Bancroft Library, University of California; Charles W. Hackett, University of Texas; George P. Hammond, University of Southern California, Los Angeles; Edgar L. Hewett, Director of the School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico; F. W. Hodge, Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, New York; J. Lloyd Mecham, University of Texas; Agapito Rey, Indiana University; A. B. Thomas, University of Oklahoma, and H. R. Wagner, San Marino, California.

The advisory editors are Herbert E. Bolton and F. W. Hodge. George P. Hammond is managing editor.

The books, which will be printed in Caslon type and annotated, will be available only to subscribing members of the Society. The rates will necessarily vary with the cost of publication, but in every case, it is said, will be very reasonable.

Among the volumes now in preparation are the following:

Relation of the Espejo Expedition to New Mexico, by Diego Pérez de Luxán.

Luxán was a member of the Espejo party to New Mexico in 1582-1583 and kept a full day-by-day account of what transpired on the journey. His story is the most detailed and reliable record we have of this significant reconaissance, and clarifies many doubtful points in the older narratives. George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey. (*In press*)

Luz de Tierra Incógnita, by Juan Mateo Manje. The author of this important account of the activities along the Arizona-Sonora border in 1693-1721 was a contemporary of the noted Jesuit Fr. Eusebio Francisco Kino. Herbert E. Bolton.

Informe á S. M. sobre las tierras de Nuevo Mejico, Quivira y Teguayo, by Fray Alonso Posadas, custodio of New Mexico in 1660-1664, and a missionary there for a number of years before. His report is extremely important on some points of New Mexico history, but it deals also with the regions to the north and east thereof. A. B. Thomas.

Memorial on New Mexico, by Fray Alonso de Benavides. This will be the hitherto unpublished revised edition of 1634, done by Benavides himself, and will be accompanied by the *Verdadera Relación* and *Segunda Relación* of Estevan de Perea, of 1632 and 1633 respectively, pertaining to the Franciscan missionaries sent to New Mexico in response to Benavides's appeal. F. W. Hodge.

Historia de la Nueva Mexico, by Gaspar de Villagrà, Alcalá, Spain, 1610. This remarkable history of the conquest of New Mexico, of which only a very few copies are in existence, still awaits publication in English. Villagrà took part in the conquest under Oñate and thus wrote of what he had seen.

A number of maps and documents of great importance for American history appear in Paul Gottschalk's *The earliest diplomatic Documents on America. The papal Bulls of 1493, and the Treaty of Tordesillas reproduced and translated with historical Introduction and explanatory Notes* (Berlin, 1927). Both original and translation into English of the documents appear in the volume.

Sr. Juan B. Terán, of Buenos Aires, who is the author of many historical volumes has recently published another book, namely, *Nacimiento de la América Española*, through the Agencia general de Librería y Publicaciones of Buenos Aires. Marcel Brión, reviewing this in Paris, in May, 1928, said:

The *Nacimiento de la América Española* is a brief but very vigorous picture of the Spanish conquest. It concerns itself with showing the structure, the skeleton, we might say, of the edifice constructed by the conquest. It is architectural, not pictorial. It is not a description of the conquest but a sketch of its most salient aspects.

Terán explains perfectly the plan and scope of his work by presenting the discovery as a link between the middle and the modern age. In investigating the transformations that took place in the Spaniards with regard to their manner of life, and their feelings and thoughts, from the time they planted themselves in the new world, he has expressed fully what he calls the tropicalization of the white or those changes which modified radically the beginnings of a civilization. Above all he has made use of the documents of the period, which are in fact the most sincere, most significative, and least vitiated testimonials which are used in modern works for the purpose of apology or polemics. Everything is worthy of citation in this work, which is so packed full of and so replete with documentation and with ingenious and profound views. We refer especially to the interesting comparison between the European and American city. These contrasts appear from the very beginning and are a material sign of the social and moral transformations which created new nations, imbued with elements of the past, impatient of enduring the Spanish yoke and of affirming their independence.

Without seeking for the easy picturesque aspects, Terán has included in this book not the deeds but the very soul of the conquest, its most intimate content, which explains clearly the great social movements. He brings to these extraordinarily complex problems those divisions which are as it were pathways for the spirit, for the powerful flights of the intelligence which surveys as on bird's wing the vastest and most obscure regions of history.

Tristão de Athayde, writing in the *O Jornal* of Rio de Janeiro, of April 29, 1929, says of this book:

Juan Terán's book is an admirable work, a model of history in method, doctrine, and expression. It is a book strictly based on facts which never become fastidious or inconclusive.

It occupies itself entirely with the sixteenth century. I have never read anything on the formation of America which has left with me so vivid an impression of having been present in person at the birth of a new civilization; and a book in which the author has not allowed himself to be dominated by details. Each chapter is a summary and a theme in which nothing is lost: sober, precise, objective but at the same time showing the personal judgment of the author which almost always is a necessary conclusion of the facts. At the end of each chapter is a resumé of the authorities on which the chapter is based together with short citations always luminous in their incisive brevity.

The true interest of the book begins with what the author calls "the tropicalization of the white" or "the transformation of the conquistador". This transformation is due to the new medium, aided by the youth of the invaders, by the distance of the country they had left, by the intimate contact with nature, by the lack of media transforming the action of that nature, and above all, by the absence of the white woman.

The conquistadores intermarried with the Indian women, and "from that union there will not arise a family in the Greco-Latin concept". We might say of the family what we have said of the American city: "in the provisional city there came to live a provisional family. Would there not be in this fount, fluid as lymph, the adventurous humor, the germ of anarchy with which the whole history of America is impregnated? The absence of woman, of fireside, of family deprives society of an abundant source of tranquillity".

And citing many chroniclers who show that union with the Indian women during the conquest, because of the absence of the white woman, he adds: "The fundamental end of the undertaking, the evangelization of the new lands, was mortally compromised from the very beginning. How could the preaching of Christianity be entrusted to an Indian woman? So it came about that the Christianization of America was formal and never penetrated into the social conscience". The conversion of America to Christianity was not a fact consummated during the conquest, but an inconclusive fact, especially among the masses of the people.

One of the most interesting chapters of this book is that which discusses the difference between reality and law. The phenomenon was identical in Brazil. Terán studies it in an admirably realistic manner. He sums it all up in the sentence of a conquistador: "The law inspires reverence; but is not executed". He sees in this false submission to law the origin of an evil profoundly American. "Here is the root of disrespect for law and authority, which is not without a protest against artificial law and illegitimate authority". . . .

In such lies the importance given by this empirical historian to the spiritual elements in the formation of America, who proposes that there be placed side by side with the type of the conquistador—which is the classic type—what he calls the type of the "anticonquistador", which he pictures incarnate in Las Casas.

If the plans of the wonderful Dominican had triumphed, he says, "the Christianization of America would have been one of truth". He concludes his book admirably by saying: "It is not, then, in the conquistador that lies the spiritual glory of America but in the anticonquistador". These are words of gold in the pen of an historian who employs a method so severely realistic as does Juan Terán.

Professor Juan B. Salazar, chief of the Departamento de Bibliotecas of the Secretaría de Educación Pública, of Mexico, in his September issue of *Boletín de Novedades Bibliográficas Mexicanas*, publishes a list as follows:

Basauri, Carlos: *Monografía de los Tarahumaras*. Mexico, Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1929. Pp. 86. Illus.

The work is divided into anthropology, physics, physiological study, ethnography, social practices and customs, and linguistics.

La Biblioteca Rural. Mexico, Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1929. Pp. 18.

Two plans.

Publication of the Departamento de Bibliotecas of the Secretaría de Educación Pública.

Boletín Estadística de la Comisión Nacional Bancaria. No. 12. Mexico, Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, September 30, 1928. Pp. 54.

A publication of the Secretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público.

Contains lists of credit institutions and of banking and similar establishments under its supervision.

Ceballos Novelo, Roque J.: *Guía para visitar las principales Ruinas arqueológicas del Estado de Morelos, Tepoztlán y Teopanzolo*. In Vol. XXI, No. 2, of the publications of the Secretaría de Educación Pública. Mexico, Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1929.

Monografía sobre el Estado actual de la Industria en Mexico. Mexico, Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1929. Pp. 104.

Published by the Dirección de Publicaciones y Propaganda of the Secretaría de Industria, Comercio y Trabajo.

Noguera, Eduardo: *Xochicalco*. In vol. XXI, no. 2, of the publications of the Secretaría de Educación Pública. Mexico, Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1929.

Proyecto de Código del Trabajo para los Estados Unidos Mexicanos, que somete el Lic. Emilio Portes Gil, Presidente de la República al H. Congreso de la Unión. Edición oficial. Mexico, Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1929. Pp. 166.

Proyectos de Trabajo de Materias Socializadoras. Mexico, 1929. Pp. 72.

Published by the Biblioteca de Proyectos. Approved by the Departamento de Enseñanzas Primaria y Normal (Salvador Lima, technical counselor).

Ramírez, Rafael: *Aritmética. Miras, programas y principios técnicos del método de Enseñanza en las Escuelas urbanas y rurales*. Mexico, Tip. "La Impresora", 1929. Pp. 29.

Tejera, Humberto: *Cultores y Forjadores de Mexico*. Mexico, Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1929. Pp. 132.

Embraces the period from the fifteenth century to the present time.

Temas de Primavera. Mexico. Casa Editorial "Agencia Maestra", S. A., 1929. Pp. 58.

This is Vol. I of "Biblioteca Práctica del Maestro".

Dr. Nicanor Sarmiento, of Buenos Aires, is the editor of an historical review in that city, which has now entered upon its second year. The review has met with that success that it deserves. It is entitled *Revista de la Academia Americana de la Historia*. This Academy was created by a resolution of the American International Congress of Bibliography and History held at Buenos Aires in 1916 under the auspices of the Argentinian government.

Terre d'America e Archivi d'Italia, by Paolo Revelli, published in Milan by "Fratelli Treves" in 1926, gives a full description of manuscripts relating to America in the various archives and libraries of Italy. Among its eighty illustrations, this valuable book, which sells for 119 lire (about \$6.50), reproduces various maps. The book is indispensable for the study of manuscripts relating to America.

La Prensa, the only daily printed in Spanish in the United States, is being used extensively in educational institutions throughout this country. Its systematic reading by the student of Hispanic American history will be found productive of good results, for it reports fully matters that reach other newspapers only in abbreviated form or not at all. It maintains cable communications with the countries of Hispanic America.

Professor A. Curtis Wilgus has about completed work on a textbook of Hispanic American history. This will contain forty-six chapters. The first three chapters cover the geographical, ethnological, and European backgrounds. Chapters 4-15 deal with colonial history; chapters 16-20, the revolutions for independence and their antecedents and causes; chapters 21-37, the modern period of the several states; chapters 38 and 39, Inter-Hispanic American relations; chapters 40-44, the relations of the United States with Hispanic America; and chapters 45 and 46, the relations of Europe and Hispanic America. There are three bibliographical appendices which include syllabi, collections of bibliographies, etc., and one appendix which is a guide to Hispanic American history maps in which are listed about 1400 maps. The book is for college and university use, and aims to supply upper-classmen with a handbook as well as a text book.

The University of California Press has just published the study made by Dr. Lillian Estelle Fisher, who took her doctorate at the University of California at Berkeley, on the Intendencia. Dr. Fisher

has been granted the Spanish Research Fellowship given by the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs to a member of the International Association of University Women, and has been allowed a year's leave of absence from her post at the Oklahoma College for Women.

The same press has also recently published two doctorate theses of primary importance, namely: *Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora, a Mexican Savant of the Seventeenth Century*, by Irving A. Leonard (No. 18 of the University of California Publications in History); and *The Encomienda in New Spain: Forced native Labor in the Spanish Colonies, 1492-1550*, by Lesley Byrd Simpson (No. 19).

The Musicale, of Dallas, Texas, is publishing a series of articles by Dr. Lota M. Spell, of Austin, on the history of music in the southwest. The first article "Music in the Southwest" appeared in the number for April, 1929, and the second, "The Spanish contribution", in May. Dr. Spell, who has long been interested in this subject, states that the beginnings of music in the southwest region were made by the Spaniards. The first music teacher in Mexico was Fray Peter of Ghent, who established his music school there in 1523, where he taught both vocal and instrumental music. In the southwest, the first music teacher was the Franciscan friar, Cristóbal de Quiñones, who came to New Mexico as early as 1604. Before his death in 1609, "he had erected a monastery at San Felipe, installed an organ in its chapel, and taught many of the natives to sing and play, both on the organ and on other instruments". The second music teacher was Bernard of Marta, who came to the western hemisphere about 1600 and was sent to New Mexico in 1605, teaching there until his death at Zea in 1635.

In the spring of 1930 Professor Mary Wilhelmine Williams of Goucher College will publish through Ginn and Company a history entitled *The People and Politics of Latin America*. The work is designed to interest the general reader as well as to be of use as a basis for college and university courses in Hispanic American history.

Professor Mary Wilhelmine Williams of Goucher College is working upon a biography of Emperor Pedro II of Brazil which is intended to be of a fairly exhaustive nature and to cover much of the history of Brazil for the era of the second Pedro.